

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC78/20-21
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(35)

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 36th meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Tuesday, 30 June 2020, from 2:32 pm to 6:31 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
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 Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
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 POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kiwok, 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
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

Members absent:

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon MA Fung-kiwok, SBS, JP

Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

Public officers attending:

Ms Alice LAU Yim, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Mr Mike CHENG Wai-man	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mr David LEUNG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare) 1
Mr Gordon LEUNG, JP	Director of Social Welfare
Mr LAM Ka-tai, JP	Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services)
Ms Barbara CHU Wing-chee	Senior Principal Executive Officer (Special Duties), Social Welfare Department
Miss Leonia TAI Shuk-yiu, JP	Government Property Administrator
Mr Ronald CHAN Chi-ping	Chief Property Manager (Acquisition, Allocation and Disposal), Government Property Agency
Mr Amor WONG Yiu-tuen	Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 3
Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP	Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Mr Peter MA Wai-chung	Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Agriculture)
Mr LAI Cheuk-ho, JP	Project Manager (North), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Teresa MA Oi-suet	Senior Engineer (6(N)), Civil Engineering and Development Department

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 Yannes HO	Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

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

2. The Deputy Chairman declared that he was an advisor of the Bank of China (Hong Kong) Limited.

**Item 8 — FCR(2020-21)6
CAPITAL WORKS RESERVE FUND**

HEAD 703 — BUILDINGS
Social Welfare — Multi-purpose/Miscellaneous
1SG — "Purchase of welfare premises"

**Item 9 — FCR(2020-21)7
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 24 JUNE 2019**

EC(2019-20)9
HEAD 170 — SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT
Subhead 000 Operational expenses

Continuation of the discussion on FCR(2020-21)6 and FCR(2020-21)7

3. The Finance Committee ("FC") continued with the discussion on item FCR(2020-21)6 and item FCR(2020-21)7.

4. The Deputy Chairman said that, since the two items were both related to the provision of welfare facilities, the items would be discussed together as had been the case at the FC meeting on 29 June 2020. The two items would be voted on separately.

5. The Deputy Chairman said that the two items invited FC to approve:

- (a) the proposal in the paper FCR(2020-21)6 on a new commitment of \$20 billion for the purchase of premises for the provision of welfare facilities; and
- (b) the proposal in the paper FCR(2020-21)7 on the recommendation of the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") made on 24 June 2019 on the creation of one permanent post of Senior Principal Executive Officer (D2) in the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") to head a new Planning and Development Branch ("PD Branch") to strengthen the planning, coordination and implementation of capital works projects of welfare premises and formulating departmental policies and procedures on all matters relating to project planning, implementation as well as management and maintenance for the provision of welfare facilities, i.e. the proposal in the paper EC(2019-20)9.

A request for separate voting for the above recommendation of ESC at the FC meeting had been made by members. The Panel on Welfare Services had discussed item FCR(2020-21)6 for 1 hour 12 minutes. ESC had discussed item FCR(2020-21)7 for about two hours. FC had discussed the two items for 2 hours 15 minutes at the meeting on 29 June 2020.

Purchase of welfare premises

Planning issues

6. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked whether there were precedent cases of using public money to purchase property. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that the target of purchasing 86 premises in the last purchase exercise in 1995-1998 had not been met. Mr CHAN asked whether the Administration would pledge to meet the target of purchasing 126 welfare premises within three years from 2020-2023.

7. Government Property Administrator said that, apart from the last purchase exercise for welfare premises in 1995-1998, there were a few cases in the past in which the Government acquired private property for provision of public service. For example, some units in Citibank Tower (now known as Champion Tower) were purchased from the property market in mid-90's for office use. Director of Social Welfare ("DSW")

said that the Government would make the best effort to acquire the 126 premises over some three years for accommodating 158 welfare facilities for services in acute demand.

8. Mr WU Chi-wai asked whether a preliminary study had been conducted prior to drawing up the number of premises to be purchased for respective services to meet the demand of the users of various service catchment areas of the districts. Mr WU expressed concern about the practical difficulty to purchase the specific welfare premises within the service catchment areas in the districts. Acquiring welfare premises beyond reach of users of the service catchment area would result in a mismatch of services. Mr WU requested SWD to:

- (a) provide written information listing out the 158 facilities under the four type of welfare services by their targeted service catchment areas in the respective district;
- (b) explain to what extent the welfare facilities of the 18 districts still fell short of the service demand pursuant to completion of the purchase exercise;;
- (c) provide the schedule upon which the Administration would target to overcome the shortfall by other medium/long term strategies; and
- (d) provide information related to the preliminary study conducted by SWD on the proposed purchase exercise, such as the service demand of the respective service catchment areas in the districts; and the potential difficulties of implementing the purchase exercise in each of the districts due to their specific conditions.

[*Post-meeting note*: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC 272/19-20(01) on 2 September 2020.]

9. Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services) ("DDSW(S)") said that the proposed plan for the purchase of 126 welfare premises in the 18 districts was drawn up pursuant to a preliminary study on the service demand of each of the districts and the potential property supply in the districts. SWD would not proceed with any purchase if the location of the potential premises was not within the catchment area of the concerned welfare services. In such cases, SWD would resort to other measures to

address the facilities shortfall, such as making provision for respective services under various new development/redevelopment projects.

10. Ms Claudia MO noted that in respect of the total of 28 welfare premises to be purchased in the Kowloon West region (viz. Kowloon City district, Yau Tsim Mong district, and Sham Shui Po district), 11 were for the provision of Neighbourhood Elderly Centres. Ms MO asked whether the numbers of premises to be purchased by service type were set based on the actual demand of the respective districts or statistical analyses.

11. DDSW(S) advised that the number of welfare premises for respective districts was assessed based on actual service demand of the districts. For example, SWD would acquire premises for the reprovisioning of the Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre ("ICYSC") in Wong Tai Sin only, as part of the premises of the existing ICYSC in the district was not barrier free. While there was great demand for all types of rehabilitation services across the territory, districts with long waiting lists and long waiting time would be accorded priority for acquiring the relevant facilities under the purchase exercise.

12. Dr KWOK Ka-ki sought clarification as to whether a property purchased under the short-term measure would be disposed of in future when the relevant welfare facility was to be reprovisioned to a new site.

13. DSW said that the purchase exercise, as a short-term measure, was to provide a fast track approach to address the shortage of welfare facilities and premises. In the case of the last purchase exercise in the 90's, the permanent premises acquired in respective districts were all currently in use to meet on-going service demand in respective districts. That said, it was possible that due to factors like enhancement of services, etc., welfare services accommodated in the purchased premises might be relocated to other sites provided under respective development/redevelopment projects.

14. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that renting premises might be a more viable alternative, as the property market might plummet in the future. Mr CHU Hoi-dick suggested that, should it happen that no premises were identified suitable for purchase in the relevant districts, SWD should allow flexibility to consider renting premises for the remaining welfare facilities on the purchase list. Mr CHU also suggested that, in case the Government Property Agency ("GPA") failed to assist SWD to fulfil its pledge for the purchase of the 126 welfare premises, GPA should continue to help SWD to reach the target number of premises through renting when the three-year period expired.

15. DSW said that at present, rental subsidy was provided for a small number of non-government organizations ("NGOs") operating on rented premises. The Government considered it more cost effective to accommodate welfare facilities in government-owned properties, which would also provide more security of tenure. SWD would exercise flexibility to enable NGOs to operate in rented premises if so required. Government Property Administrator said that there was an established mechanism for SWD to seek funding to cover the rental costs of welfare facilities.

Coverage of welfare services under the purchase exercise

Residential Care Homes for the Elderly and Small Group Homes

16. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked whether it was the policy of the Government to exclude the provision of Residential Care Homes for the Elderly ("RCHEs") in the purchase exercise. DDSW said that the purpose of the purchase exercise was to purchase premises in the private property market to enable early provision of welfare facilities in acute shortage. Considering that there were more stringent technical and layout requirements for the provision of RCHEs, such as requirements in respect of headroom, lighting and ventilation, the Government considered it more appropriate to accommodate RCHEs in purpose-built premises.

17. Mr SHIU Ka-chun considered that residential child care service was among the welfare facilities with acute shortage. While three Small Group Homes ("SGHs") were acquired in the 1995-1998 purchase exercise with a floor area of around 160 square metres, such facilities were not covered in the current proposal. Mr SHIU asked whether there had been a change of policy of the purchase exercise in comparison to the last exercise.

18. DSW and DDSW(S) reiterated that the proposed exercise had to be considered in conjunction with other medium and long term measures. The Government had provided at Enclosure 3 of the discussion paper a list of planned welfare facilities with target completion date up to 2028 which included seven SGHs and one SGH for Mildly Mentally Handicapped Children. DDSW(S) said that provision of residential care services for children had been included under new development/redevelopment projects in recent years. A case in point was the provision of an SGH under the redevelopment of So Uk Estate. Dr Fernando CHEUNG remarked that, as at the end of March 2020, around 50 mildly mentally handicapped children were on the waiting list for SGH. The planned provision of seven SGHs

(with eight children at each SGH) targeted for completion at 2028 lagged far behind the current and future demand for such service.

Operation mechanism

Monitoring of the purchase exercise

19. Dr Fernando CHEUNG urged SWD to invite independent persons and representatives of service users to join the Steering Committee jointly set up by SWD and GPA to keep the stakeholders apprised of the progress of the purchase exercise. Noting the Administration's concern about the need to keep property purchase strategies confidential, Dr CHEUNG said that it would suffice to keep the stakeholders informed of the progress of the purchase exercise and the welfare premises acquired for their timely feedback.

20. Mr KWONG Chun-yu asked how the Administration would convince members that it could be entrusted with the responsibility for using the \$20 billion properly, despite SWD's commitment to reporting to LegCo yearly on the progress.

21. Ms Claudia MO remarked that, in view of the fluid market situation, the Administration should exercise good judgment when considering the timing to commit a transaction. Ms MO enquired whether the Administration had signed any letter of intent in relation to any prospective transaction at this stage.

22. DSW advised that:

- (a) the Steering Committee comprising representatives from different government departments would ensure that the purchase exercise would be conducted in accordance with the established mechanism. Based on SWD's study and the requirements of the welfare premises to be purchased by location, number, floor area, service type, operational and technical requirements, GPA's professional staff would conduct survey on potential suitable premises in the property market, and also, among other channels, invite property owners/agencies to provide offer through the Government website;
- (b) GPA's professional staff of the sub-committee to be set up for the purchase exercise would make reference to recent transaction prices of similar premises in the same district and

set a price ceiling for suitable premises based on the relevant property's market value. GPA would not proceed with any purchase should the sale price be above the price ceiling set for the relevant premises. So far, the Government had not signed any letter of intent in relation to any prospective transaction; and

- (c) a mechanism would be available for declaration of interest for all public officers involved in the purchase exercise in accordance with the established procedure. The officers involved would be required to declare their interests and were bound by relevant laws (including the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance) and the Civil Service Code (including avoidance of conflict of interest, and observing confidentiality and non-disclosure of information). The Government considered it not appropriate to engage independent persons and representatives of service users in the Steering Committee as its deliberations would involve market-sensitive information.

In response to Ms Claudia MO's suggestion that SWD should report to LegCo on a half-yearly basis, DSW said that it would require more time at the early phase of the purchase exercise to draw up and refine the operation mechanism. SWD planned to report to LegCo on the progress of the implementation of the purchase exercise on a yearly basis after FC had approved the item.

Declaration of interest

23. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked whether the public officers involved in the purchase scheme should declare the property owned by them and their relatives in the respective districts; and the circumstances under which a public officer should abstain from the relevant discussions and decisions to avoid conflict of interest.

24. DSW said that there was a well-established mechanism in the Government governing the declaration and management of conflict of interests, under which the circumstances for a public officer to declare investment/interest, and guidelines for making management decisions on how to deal with such declarations, were clearly set out. SWD would seek advice from the Independent Commission Against Corruption on the operational mechanism for the purchase exercise, including avoidance of conflict of interest provisions, in due course.

25. Noting that the purchase and renting of premises for government use was under the purview of GPA, Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked about the on-going mechanism of GPA for the monitoring of public officers in carrying out duties related to purchase of properties. Government Property Administrator advised that there were internal guidelines to be abided by professional grade staff (such as surveyor grade staff) of GPA in the renting or purchasing of premises for government use. The professional surveyors of the sub-committee to be set up for the purchase exercise would follow the established procedures to assess the market value of suitable premises by reference to recent transaction prices of similar premises in the relevant district and set a price ceiling for the purchase of the relevant property based on its market value.

Valuation and assessment

26. Mr KWOK Wai-keung expressed strong support for the proposed purchase exercise and said that SWD should go ahead with it without hesitation. Mr KWOK remarked that, prior to commissioning a transaction, the Administration should conduct thorough checking on the building management of the private property, such as the role and obligations required of an owner in respect of building maintenance, renovation and repair; and management of the common parts of the building. The Administration should also examine whether the relevant premises had been involved in legal proceedings, had complied with mandatory building inspection requirements, and details relating to owners' voting right on matters related to building maintenance.

27. Government Property Administrator advised that GPA, being the representative of Financial Secretary Incorporated ("FSI") as the owner of premises in private developments, would fulfill the owner's role and obligations in respect of the FSI properties, including the casting of votes at meetings of the Owners' Corporation related to building maintenance and other matters.

Medium and long term measures

28. Mr SHIU Ka-chun said that in respect of enhancing welfare facilities provision, the Administration had not made full use of the existing measures, such as the Scheme to Encourage Provision of Residential Care Home for the Elderly Premises in New Private Developments ("the Scheme") implemented since 2003, and the redevelopment projects under the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"). Mr SHIU pointed out that only one application from private developer had been approved by the Lands Department for development of RCHE under the Scheme, and 11

development projects of URA were planned with the provision of welfare facilities. Mr SHIU asked whether the Administration would consider making it mandatory for private property developers and URA to include welfare facility provision in their development projects in future.

29. DSW advised that whether a development project should include welfare facilities would be subject to considerations such as the land use, site area, and the location of the projects. Labour and Welfare Bureau and SWD would work closely with the Development Bureau and relevant government departments with a view to increasing the provision of welfare facilities in the new development/redevelopment projects as far as possible. In response to Mr SHIU, DSW said that the number of applications from private developers under the Scheme remained at one.

30. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that the proposed exercise, as a short-term measure, could barely meet the prevailing shortfall of welfare facilities. Dr CHEUNG enquired about the long-term measures to cope with rising service demand.

31. Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)1 ("DSLW(W)1") said that 370 additional welfare facilities were expected to be completed by 2028 through the implementation of some 100 projects. An additional 12 000 places for elderly care services and 10 000 for rehabilitation services would be made available upon the implementation of these projects. On the other hand, upon the completion of some 50 projects under Phase One of the Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses ("Special Sites Scheme"), there would be an addition of 17 000 places particularly for elderly and rehabilitation services. DSLW(W)1 advised that the population-based planning ratios, in respect of elderly and child care facilities, were incorporated into the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines in December 2018 and March 2020 respectively. In the meantime, the formulation of planning ratios for rehabilitation services was underway.

Use of vacant Government sites/vacant school premises

32. Mr Michael TIEN said that he would support the proposal if SWD was able to confirm that all vacant government sites with building structure and all vacant school premises were not suitable for conversion into welfare facilities.

33. DSW said that SWD had reviewed a list of 940 sites (with around 40 vacant school premises) maintained by the Lands Department, but found that the sites were either inaccessible to the public, situated at locations

with poor road conditions or without readily available premises for immediate use. SWD had also examined the 21 vacant sites with structure posted at GPA's website available for short-term leasing, and found that these vacant sites were all infeasible for conversion to welfare facilities. Examples of such vacant sites included, among others, workers' quarters in the reservoir catchment area, water pumping station, structure on inaccessible outlying islands and piers, etc.

Vacant sites in housing estates

34. Dr KWOK Ka-ki questioned whether SWD had made all necessary effort to collaborate with the Housing Authority to increase welfare facilities in public housing estates ("PHEs"). Dr KWOK said that the Administration had refused to consider a suggestion to convert a vacant commercial premises at Cheung Ching Estate to welfare facilities for the elderly. Dr KWOK remarked that a vacant carpark building in Yat Tung Estate, Tung Chung managed by the Link REIT, and an entire level in Maritime Square in Tsing Yi managed by MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") had both been left unused for a long period of time. Dr KWOK queried as to why SWD had not sought Link REIT and MTRCL's collaboration to make use of the vacant premises for the provision of welfare services.

35. DSW said that the purchase exercise would not cover properties under Link REIT due to restrictive covenants of the relevant assignment deed, which prohibited the retail facilities to be sold or assigned except as a whole. Whether the purchase exercise would cover properties owned by MTRCL would be subject to the suitability of the premises and the specific requirements of the welfare facilities. Government Property Administrator said that the chance to purchase premises from MTRCL was slim as most of the MTRCL premises were on lease.

Proposed creation of a directorate post

36. Mr SHIU Ka-chun considered that the proposed directorate post of Assistant Director (Planning and Development) ("AD(PD)") should be created on a supernumerary rather than permanent basis. Mr SHIU said that the lack of commitment of the Government to long-term planning in the past had resulted in the prevailing acute area shortfall. He queried whether the Government was genuinely committed to enhancing welfare services in the territory in the long run. Ms Claudia MO considered that the responsibilities of the proposed post was mainly to oversee ongoing projects rather than initiating new planning and development projects for service enhancement.

37. DSW advised that the proposed post would be dedicated to overseeing a total of some 250 planned projects currently under the planning and coordination of the project planning section of SWD, which would require continual commitment of a permanent staff. Many of the planned projects in the pipeline were related to enhancing elderly and child care services which were in acute shortage. In addition to overseeing the implementation of the purchase exercise, the proposed post would be responsible for the Special Sites Schemes under which NGOs were encouraged to expand and redevelop their sites for enhanced services. In addition, the directorate post was designated to oversee the delivery of management and maintenance services of existing welfare premises.

Financial implication

38. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked whether the allocation of \$20 billion was an estimate to meet the actual service demand for respective services through the purchase of 126 welfare premises; or whether the number of premises to be purchased was worked out taking into account the budget limit.

39. DSW said that the provision of \$20 billion was an estimate for the implementation of the purchase exercise to address the acute shortage of welfare facilities and premises over some three years. DSW reiterated that the proposed exercise to meet the service demand of the territory would complement other medium- and long-term measures to increase the provision of welfare premises.

40. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan enquired about the estimated recurrent operational cost of the 126 welfare premises to be purchased. Mr WU Chi-wai asked whether there was an estimate for the non-recurrent expenditure on fitting-out, furnishing and equipping the 126 premises to be purchased.

41. DSW and DDSW(S) said that:

- (a) the recurrent operational cost of the welfare premises would be included in the annual Estimates. Under the current subvention mode, recurrent operational expenditure of the NGOs operating welfare services was covered in the grant to the NGOs according to the scale and type of service provision;

- (b) the estimated recurrent operational expenditure of 58 new welfare facilities (out of a total of about 160 welfare facilities) to be provided under the purchase exercise was around \$472 million; and
- (c) it was estimated that the - (a) fitting out; and (b) furniture and equipment installation of the 126 welfare premises would cost about - (a) \$785 million; and (b) \$185 million respectively. The non-recurrent expenditure would be allocated under the Lotteries Fund.

42. Mr CHU Hoi-dick sought explanation on the projected cashflow for acquiring 42 premises for each of the three years from 2020-2023 as detailed in paragraph 7 of FCR(2020-21)6. Mr CHU noted that only \$2,552 million was earmarked for 2022-2023, while \$8,926 million and \$8,520 million were respectively earmarked in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022.

43. DSW advised that the projected cashflow was for planning purpose. The Government planned to expedite the purchase exercise for providing 116 welfare facilities in the first two years. Whether the Administration could complete the purchase of the remaining 42 welfare facilities in the last phase would depend on the funding which would remain from the previous two years. Government Property Administrator said that the number of premises to be purchased and the expenditure to be incurred in 2020-2021 would depend on the progress of the preparation work for setting up the operation mechanism and the availability of suitable premises for sale in the market.

Motion proposed by a member under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure

44. At 3:55 pm, FC voted on whether a [motion](#) proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure ("FCP") should be proceeded with forthwith. At the request of members, the Deputy Chairman ordered a division. The Deputy Chairman declared that the question on proceeding with the motion forthwith was [carried](#).

45. The Deputy Chairman said that each member might speak once on the FCP 37A motion proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG for no more than three minutes.

46. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that given the huge lump sum of \$20 billion allocated for the purchase exercise, the Administration should

set up an independent steering committee with the participation of independent persons and representatives of service users to ensure that public funding was used properly; and the welfare premises acquired were suitable and easily accessible. Prompted by Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr CHEUNG said that he would vote against the proposal if the Administration did not respond to the motion positively.

47. Mr LUK Chung-hung said that the issue as to whether or not an independent steering committee was to be set up should not pre-empt members' support for the items. Mr LUK called on SWD to ensure prudent use of public fund and put in place a mechanism to avoid bid-rigging and transfer of interest.

48. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that he supported the motion as the request stated therein was reasonable and was in line with the established mechanism of the Government to invite independent persons to sit on relevant committees (such as the Community Care Fund Task Force and the Commission on Poverty). Mr CHU said that he would vote against the item if the Administration did not respond to the motion positively.

49. Mr YIU Si-wing was concerned that the appointment of independent persons and representatives of service users to the Steering Committee would complicate the matter as it might give rise to issues relating to the appointment mechanism.

50. In response, DSW reiterated that the Government all along had an established mechanism to deal with purchase of premises for provision of public services. The main roles of the Steering Committee set up for the premises purchase exercise were to oversee the overall conduct of the exercise and make a collective decision on each transaction. It would not involve any policy formulation or discussions. Based on SWD's requirements on the premises to be purchased in respect of location, number, floor area, service type, operational and technical requirements, GPA's professional grade staff would identify potential premises in the market through multiple channels. The professional grade staff would by reference to recent transaction prices of similar premises in the relevant districts set reasonable price ceilings based on the market value. This would ensure that the purchase prices of premises would be in line with the prevailing market values of the premises concerned and the prudent use of public money. A mechanism would be put in place for the declaration of interests for all public officers involved in the purchase exercise in accordance with the Government's established procedure. In sum, the purchase of premises would be governed by GPA's established mechanism and the specific operation mechanism set up for the exercise. In addition,

the Government would report the progress of the purchase exercise to LegCo on a yearly basis so as to increase the transparency of the whole exercise. Hence, the Government did not consider it necessary to set up an independent steering committee with the participation of independent persons and representatives of service users.

51. In reply, Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed disappointment on the Administration's response. He queried the professionalism of GPA staff who were not familiar with the requirements of welfare service users. He cited a case that the floor area of the physiotherapy and healthcare facilities of a hostel cum training centre for handicapped children in a reprovisioning project, which was vetted by GPA, was smaller than the previous provision, notwithstanding that the number of service users had increased by 50%.

52. After Dr Fernando CHEUNG had spoken in reply, the Deputy Chairman put the motion moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG to vote. The Deputy Chairman announced that the motion was carried. The wording of the motion and the voting results are given in **Appendices I and II**.

[Post-meeting note: The Administration's response to the motion was issued on 2 September 2020 vide LC Paper No. FC272/19-20(01)]

Voting on FCR(2020-21)6

53. At 4:17 pm, the Deputy Chairman put item FCR(2020-21)6 to vote. At the request of members, the Deputy Chairman ordered a division. The Deputy Chairman declared that 19 members voted in favour of and 18 members voted against the item, and no member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Ms Starry LEE Wai-king	Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun
Mr Steven HO Chun-yin	Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Mr POON Siu-ping
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding	Mr SHIU Ka-fai
Ms YUNG Hoi-yan	Mr LUK Chung-hung
Mr Kenneth LAU Ip-keung	Mr Vincent CHENG Wing-shun
Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen	
(19 members)	

Against:

Ms Claudia MO	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr Charles Peter MOK	Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr KWOK Ka-ki	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	Ms Tanya CHAN
Mr HUI Chi-fung	Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr KWONG Chun-yu	Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho
(18 members)	

54. The Deputy Chairman declared that the item was approved.

Voting on FCR(2020-21)7

55. At 4:23 pm, the Deputy Chairman put item FCR(2020-21)7 to vote. At the request of members, the Deputy Chairman ordered a division. The Deputy Chairman declared that 22 members voted in favour of and 18 members voted against the item, and no member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Ms Starry LEE Wai-king	Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun
Mr Steven HO Chun-yin	Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Ms Elizabeth QUAT
Mr POON Siu-ping	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok	Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan
Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding	Mr SHIU Ka-fai
Ms YUNG Hoi-yan	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Mr LUK Chung-hung	Mr Kenneth LAU Ip-keung
Mr Vincent CHENG Wing-shun	Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen
(22 members)	

Against:

Ms Claudia MO	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr Charles Peter MOK	Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr KWOK Ka-ki	Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan	Mr IP Kin-yuen

Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr SHIU Ka-chun
Mr HUI Chi-fung
Mr KWONG Chun-yu
(18 members)

Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Ms Tanya CHAN
Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho

56. The Deputy Chairman declared that the item was approved.

57. The meeting was suspended at 4:28 pm and resumed at 4:38 pm. The Chairman took the chair and declared that he was an Executive Director and the Chief Executive Officer of Well Link Insurance Group Holdings Limited.

Item 10 — FCR(2019-20)20

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 26 APRIL 2019**

PWSC(2018-19)43

**HEAD 707 — NEW TOWNS AND URBAN AREA DEVELOPMENT
Recreation, Culture and Amenities — Open spaces**

**471RO — The Establishment of an Agricultural Park in Kwu
Tung South**

58. The Chairman advised that the item sought FC's approval of the recommendation made by the Public Works Subcommittee at its meeting held on 26 April 2019 regarding the proposals in PWSC(2018-19)43 to upgrade part of 471RO, entitled "The Establishment of an Agricultural Park ("Agri-Park") in Kwu Tung South – Phase 1", to Category A at an estimated cost of \$176.6 million in money-of-the-day prices; and retain the remainder of 471RO in Category B.

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

Co-location of living place and farm for displaced farmers

60. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed concern that farmers currently residing in the site for the establishment of the Agri-Park would be rehoused in public housing units far away from their farms if they chose to rehabilitate their farms in the Agri-Park. Although these affected farmers would also be offered basic lodging units at the Agri-Park on rental basis, these units

provided only a temporary resting place for farmers and were not meant for long-term residential purpose. As a result, the farmers could not maintain their living-cum-farming lifestyle and closely look after their crops, even under unforeseen circumstances or inclement weather. Dr KWOK also noted that tenants of the Agri-Park would be required to take/store their farming equipment from/in prescribed storage units before/after working on the fields, which might be inconvenient to the tenants. Besides, they would not be allowed to use irrigation methods of their own choice but had to switch to new irrigation methods such as sprinkler and drip. Dr KWOK criticized the Administration for not having planned the Agri-Park from the perspective of the affected farmers and the above arrangements were tantamount to forcing these farmers to abandon farming.

61. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation ("DAFC") responded that as far as Agri-Park Phase 1 was concerned, the affected farmers were not residing within the project site currently. If the farmers chose to rehabilitate their farms at the Agri-Park, temporary lodging units would be provided in the Park as a resting place near their farms for them to manage their crops, but such lodging units were not meant for residential purpose. Storage units would also be provided for the farmers to store their farming inputs and equipment. DAFC pointed out that the Agri-Park aimed to help nurture agro-technology and knowledge on modern and environment-friendly farm management through leasing farmland and providing associated agricultural facilities for farmers to conduct commercial production. For instance, the sprinkler irrigation system to be provided in the Park was meant to encourage farmers to adopt a more water-saving and efficient irrigation method.

62. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that he did not subscribe to DAFC's views that Agri-Park Phase 1 would not displace any affected farmers' living places. In his understanding, some households would be affected by related road works in Tsiu Keng. Mr CHU criticized that the rehousing arrangements for existing farmers operating within the area of the Agri-Park and farmers displaced by other government development projects (such as the North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NENT NDAs") Project), which separated the farmers' living places from their farms, had grossly neglected the interests of the farmers to maintain their living-cum-farming lifestyle. Mr CHU was also concerned that the temporary lodging units at the Agri-Park would be very shabby and farmers would suffer from sweltering heat and other unfavourable conditions inside the units. He queried why the Administration would not consider providing permanent lodging units under Agri-Park Phase 1 for rehousing the affected farmers.

63. Dr CHENG Chung-tai shared Mr CHU Hoi-dick's views and queried whether the affected farmers would be willing to travel to and from their farms for two to three hours daily if they were rehoused at public housing units far away from the farms; and whether it was justified to require farmers to switch from their existing farming practices to modern ones adopted by the Agri-Park. In this connection, the Administration should explain clearly the objectives and positioning of the Agri-Park, for instance, whether it was intended to promote leisure farming or enterprise farming.

64. Mr Steven HO expressed the following views:

- (a) the Agri-Park project stemmed from the proposal of establishing an Integrated Agricultural Village which aimed at integrating and concentrating the fragmented agricultural industry in certain areas of Hong Kong, so that arable lands in other areas could be released for housing and other infrastructural development. He however opined that the project was not comprehensive enough as it had not included the integration of livestock and poultry industry as well in one go;
- (b) the majority of existing farmers in Hong Kong did not own their farmland. Even if they were not displaced by any government development projects, these farmers were facing the same risks of losing their livelihood and/or living places as their landlords might discontinue leasing the farmland to them. Through the Agri-Park project, farmers displaced by government development projects could continue farming in a stable and sustainable manner, while securing a living place at public housing units. This would better protect the interests of the farmers in the long run, in particular when they retired or ceased to be farmers;
- (c) conventional farming practices might no longer be conducive to a sustainable development of the agricultural industry in Hong Kong, and the transition towards modern farm management was bound to bring about changes to conventional farming practices. Although the affected farmers might resist such changes at the outset, adopting more efficient farming practices would help alleviate the burden of farmers and improve their livelihood in the long run;

- (d) the Administration should clarify the rehousing arrangements for displaced farmers with reference to the relevant prevailing policies, such as the policy on rehousing domestic households in squatter structures affected by government development clearance exercises; and
- (e) members should not, for the purpose of seeking public support, incite political conflicts regarding the Agri-Park project.

65. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed support for the concept of establishing the Agri-Park with a view to revitalizing and sustaining the development of the local agricultural industry. Referring to a meeting with some affected farmers during a visit to the site in Kwu Tung South and Fanling for establishing the Agri-Park, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr CHEUNG conveyed the farmers' concerns about the potential adverse impact on their livelihood if they would not be allowed to reside in the Agri-Park and preserve their living-cum-farming lifestyle. In particular, it would be difficult for the farmers to attend to their fields late at night or early in the morning for farming activities such as artificial pollination and disinsectization. Given the daily routine of farming activities, some of which at odd hours, it would not suffice to provide the farmers with merely temporary lodging units near the fields for occasional stay. Mr CHAN also asked about whether farmers from the same household would be allotted separate temporary lodging units at the Agri-Park.

66. Mr SHIU Ka-chun remarked that when members of the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene visited the farmers at the potential site of the Agri-Park on 28 February 2019, the farmers had expressed concerns mainly about (a) the adverse impacts of the proposed road alignment under Agri-Park Phase 1 on the private land/structures and existing communities in the vicinity; and (b) discontinuation of their living-cum-farming lifestyle after rehabilitation at the Park. Noting that the Administration's consultant would examine the actual operational needs of farmers for the construction of permanent lodging units under Agri-Park Phase 2, Mr SHIU queried why only temporary lodging units would be provided in Phase 1.

67. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired whether the 40 farms estimated to be provided in Agri-Park Phase 1 could accommodate all farmers displaced by the Agri-Park project and other government development projects implemented within the same timeframe and meeting the relevant criteria; and whether there would be any surplus farmland in Phases 1 and 2 for

lease to other farmers. Mr YIU suggested the Administration consider, as a special arrangement, the rehousing proposals (if any) from the affected farmers. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan enquired about the progress of rehousing farmers displaced by the Agri-Park project.

68. DAFC advised that the Agri-Park aimed to introduce modern or innovative technologies and modern farm management to local farms (most of which were using conventional farming practices at present), with a view to enhancing and diversifying their production through leasing farmland and providing associated farming facilities to the farmers. The Agri-Park was also expected to provide a suitable environment for organic farming and adoption of modern agro-technologies such as hydroponic production and vertical farming. Tenants of the Agri-Park had to accept the relevant tenancy terms and conditions and meet the agreed production target.

69. DAFC further advised that Agri-Park Phase 1 could accommodate all the 15 farmers currently operating in that area. While their farmland would be displaced by the project, these farmers were not residing in the site concerned and hence their living places had not been affected. The Administration had discussed with the affected farmers regarding the design, operation, management and rental, etc. of the Agri-Park and their concerns had been addressed at large. The Government would endeavour to carry out a seamless relocation of the affected farmers. As regards the three households affected by the proposed road works, they were not farmers. Rehousing arrangement in accordance with the prevailing general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements and domestic removal allowances would be offered to these households as applicable. DAFC further said that given the acute shortage of land resources in Hong Kong, and the limited arable land at the Agri-Park site, it was essential to maximize the use of such land for farming (instead of housing/rehousing) as far as practicable. To address the farming needs of the farmers, a temporary lodging unit of about 15 m² near the farmland would be provided for the tenant (or his/her worker) to stay on the site to manage the farm and produce as needed, and a storage unit of about 7.5 m² to keep the production inputs and farming equipment to hand. DAFC stressed that the provision and use of the temporary lodging units was intended for the operation of the farms, not the farmers' residential use. Taking into account the relatively small-scale of Agri-Park Phase 1 and to enable early commissioning of the Park, only temporary lodging units would be constructed under this phase whereas permanent lodging units would be constructed under Phase 2 as the latter units required construction of more complementary facilities such as sewerage.

70. Mr CHU Hoi-dick remained unconvinced and suggested that the Administration should consider offering permanent lodging units for residential purpose under Phase 1 by:

- (a) enhancing the design and space of the temporary lodging units so that the affected farmers could choose between the lodging unit and public housing unit for rehousing;
- (b) making available lodging units of different sizes to cater for a wider range of purposes (i.e. occasional stay or permanent residence); and/or
- (c) offering permanent lodging units to displaced farmers while they were Agri-Park tenants and requiring them to vacate the units and switch to public housing units when the farmland's tenancy agreements ended.

In his view, the above alternatives would not take up much additional arable farmland and would help maximize the use of public housing resources.

71. DAFC stressed that as a matter of policy, the Government would handle the housing and agricultural rehabilitation needs of farmers affected by the Agri-Park and other government development projects separately, and housing issues should not be dealt with in the context of the Agri-Park.

72. Dr CHENG Chung-tai sought the Administration's assessment of the remuneration and fringe benefits which might appeal to farmers for working at the Agri-Park. He was concerned that enterprise tenants might hire two-way permit holders to work at their farms, which would threaten the livelihood of local farmers or even phase them out from the industry. DAFC said that Agri-Park tenants might engage in farming by themselves or through hiring of workers. A set of guidelines would be drawn up for the management of the Agri-Park, including the eligibility of farmers for admission to the Park. An advisory body would be set up to advise on the overall development and management of the Agri-Park.

73. Mr YIU Si-wing asked about whether the farmers could organize visits by students and other members of the public to their farms in the Agri-Park for commercial or educational purposes. DAFC said that tenants of the Agri-Park would be permitted to open their farms for the public and visitors to participate in farming-related educational activities, sharing sessions and experiential activities, and commercial activities for

selling their produce. He believed that this would help raise public awareness of the Park's operation.

Temporary lodging units and storage units

74. Mr Steven HO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr CHIANG Lai-wan enquired about the design and standard of the temporary lodging units, and the criteria for allotting the units. Mr CHAN opined that while the temporary lodging units were expected to be used for occasional stay, the tenants and their workers might stay in the units for most of the days due to operational needs. As such, the Administration should consider enhancing the design and space of the temporary lodging units.

75. The Project Manager (North), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("PM(N)/CEDD") advised that the design and materials of the temporary lodging units, which were two-storey structures, would be similar to those of the temporary quarantine units. The contractor had been requested to provide heat insulation measures on the roof of the lodging units. The lodging units would be equipped with fresh water and electricity supply as well as toilet and showering facilities. The design would also include space for installation of air-conditioners arranged by tenants.

76. DAFC advised that the current plan was to allot one temporary lodging unit to each tenant/farm with production area of not less than three dau chung, and one storage unit regardless of the size of the production area. If spare units were available and subject to assessment of the respective farmers' operational needs, some farmers might be allowed to rent more than one temporary lodging unit and/or storage unit. Based on the discussion with the affected farmers, allotting one temporary lodging unit to each tenant according to the above criteria should be sufficient.

77. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked about whether Agri-Park tenants would be allowed to cook over flame inside the temporary lodging unit. DAFC advised that as the lodging units in Agri-Park Phase 1 were temporary structures, and in accordance with the relevant fire safety regulations, cooking over flame would not be permitted inside the units but tenants might use other cooking methods. The need for cooking over flame and other operational needs of farmers would be examined for the construction of permanent lodging units in Phase 2.

78. Mr SHIU Ka-shun enquired about the rental level of the temporary lodging and storage units. He expressed concern about the additional expenses incurred by the rental on the affected farmers after rehabilitation

at the Agri-Park. DAFC advised that with respect to the affected farmers, the Administration's preliminary plan was to charge the rental based on the "recovery of recurrent expenditures" principle. Subject to further assessment in the light of actual operation of the Agri-Park, the annual rental for a temporary lodging unit and a storage unit was estimated to be about \$5,000 and \$3,000 respectively. Taking into account the size and maintenance cost of the facilities, the estimated annual rental was considered reasonable. The Administration had also discussed with the affected farmers and the latter found the estimated annual rental level acceptable. DAFC pointed out that rental expenses might likewise be borne by farmers working on leased farmland if they were currently using similar facilities on rental basis.

Tenancy and production target

79. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the criteria and production target to be met by farmers/displaced farmers for admission/rehabilitation to/in the Agri-Park. Ms Claudia MO asked about whether the tenancy agreement would prescribe any production target, types of crops and farming methods for tenants. She expressed concern that farmers displaced by the Agri-Park project who chose to continue farming at the Park might be forced to cease their farming operation upon expiry of the first tenancy agreement since it might be difficult for the farmers to meet the production target and seek redress of any grievances.

80. DAFC advised that the Government was committed to accommodating the displaced farmers in the Agri-Park if they wished to continue farming thereat. All tenants operating in the Agri-Park would be required to sign tenancy agreements. Preliminarily, the standard tenancy period was five years. Subject to fulfilling the agreed tenancy conditions including the applicable production target, the tenants would be considered for tenancy renewal for another five years. He believed that compared to general tenancy agreements with private landowners, the Agri-Park would provide a relatively more stable environment and certainty for the farmers to continue farming and make related investments.

81. DAFC said that as with admission of other farmers to the Agri-Park, farmers displaced by the Agri-Park project and government development projects implemented within the same timeframe of the Agri-Park would be required to meet production target under the tenancy agreement. The production target would be set based on the discussion and agreement with the farmers concerned, after taking into account the type of crops and production mode. Technical support would be rendered to tenants to help them adopt sustainable farming practices to meet the

production target. As it might take time for tenants to adapt to new farming practices and meet the production target, some leeway would be given if the tenants could not meet the target in the initial tenancy period.

82. The Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Agriculture) ("AD(A)/AFCD") supplemented that to ensure reasonable production output, all tenants would be required to submit an annual production plan and target to the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD") for assessment of their overall productivity. While the tenants would be encouraged to adopt environment-friendly farming methods, they would be free to choose the kinds of crops to be grown and the farming system to be adopted (e.g. conventional or organic farming). AFCD would provide free technical support and advice to tenants to help them meet the target and improve productivity. Moreover, AFCD would also provide free machinery and equipment lending services.

Road scheme and other infrastructures for Agricultural Park

83. Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired about the design of the proposed long access road connecting the existing Tsiu Keng Road and Fan Kam Road under Agri-Park Phase 1, the width of Tsiu Keng Road, and the potential impact of the proposed road on the existing farmers nearby. Mr TAM cautioned that the Administration should assess the technical feasibility and potential impacts of road works under both Phases 1 and 2 in a holistic manner, including early assessment of the amount of land and number of existing structures to be resumed due to the road works under Phase 2, with a view to resolving any issues early. Mr Holden CHOW expressed concern whether the design of the proposed road would cater for use of large vehicles by the Agri-Park tenants and the anticipated higher traffic demand arising from the Park's operation.

84. PM(N)/CEDD said that the proposed access road would be a single two-lane carriageway of 7.3 m wide. While the existing Tsiu Keng Road was a one lane carriageway for two-way traffic with lay-bys, it would need to be widened to 7.3 m under Agri-Park Phase 2. As the detailed design of Phase 2 was still underway, there was no time-table at this stage for completing the widening works of Tsiu Keng Road. The Government would take into account the operational experience of Phase 1 to determine the scope of road works and other infrastructures under Phase 2. DAFC advised that the design of the proposed access road, which would form part of the road network within the Agri-Park, together with the future widening of the relevant section of Tsiu Keng Road which had been confirmed technically feasible, would meet the overall objectives, long-term operational needs and road safety requirements of the Agri-Park, including

the use of large vehicles for transportation of farming machinery, equipment and produce. Due regard would be given to minimizing adverse impact on nearby residents/farmers and environment. PM(N)/CEDD and DAFC further advised that given the small number of farmers operating in Agri-Park Phase 1 and the expected different travelling time schedules of Park tenants and other parties using the roads concerned, the proposed road scheme of Phase 1 and the existing Tsiu Keng Road should be able to cope with the traffic demand in that phase, before the widening of Tsiu Keng Road.

85. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the public transportation available for Agri-Park tenants who were farmers displaced by the NENT NDA project and rehoused at Po Shek Wu Estate in Sheung Shui to commute between the Park and the said estate, and the estimated travelling time. PM(N)/CEDD said that such tenants might take public light bus plying between Sheung Shui and Fanling for the purpose, with a travelling time of about 10 odd minutes depending on the actual traffic conditions.

86. Mr Alvin YEUNG expressed concern that out of the 57 objections received during the statutory objection period in relation to the road scheme gazetted in November 2017, 55 objections remained unresolved. He queried if any genuine follow-up actions had been taken by the Administration to resolve these objections since the gazettal.

87. With reference to the procedures for public consultation on road schemes in general, PM(N)/CEDD and DAFC explained that the Government had arranged objection resolving meetings and provided written responses to the 57 objectors. Thereafter, two objections were withdrawn while 55 objections remained unresolved. The Government had tried its best to address the concerns of the objectors, and considered that the road scheme as gazetted in November 2017 and proposed to FC was appropriate for meeting the long-term development needs of the Agri-Park. No changes had been made to the gazetted road scheme after consideration of the unresolved objections. In accordance with the established procedures, the gazetted road scheme together with the 55 unresolved objections were then submitted to the Chief Executive-in-Council for consideration. On 27 November 2018, the Chief Executive-in-Council authorized the proposed road scheme and approved the resumption of land for the establishment of Agri-Park Phase 1. Subject to funding approval for the establishment of Agri-Park Phase 1, rehousing arrangement in accordance with the prevailing general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements as well as domestic removal allowances would be offered to eligible households, whereas ex-gratia allowances ("EGA") would be paid to the displaced farmers under the

current EGA policy. In reply to Mr Alvin YEUNG's further enquiry, PM(N)/CEDD said that no objections had been received during the statutory objection period in relation to the aesthetic design or other aspects of the culvert bridge and vehicular bridges which would form parts of the proposed road.

88. In response to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's enquiry about the design capacity of the drainage facilities of the Agri-Park, PM(N)/CEDD said that the design capacity of the main drainage facilities could withstand rainstorms of a 50-year return period. He undertook to provide supplementary information to explain the design capacity of the drainage system with reference to rainfall intensity, etc.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC244/19-20(01) on 14 July 2020.]

Project timeframe

89. Mr Holden CHOW expressed support for early commissioning of the Agri-Park to benefit the agricultural industry. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan enquired about the time-table for taking forward Agri-Park Phase 1. DAFC said that subject to FC's funding approval, the construction works of Agri-Park Phase 1 would commence in the fourth quarter of 2020 for completion in 2023. Admission of affected farmers would start in the fourth quarter of 2021 at the earliest.

Other issues

90. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the Administration's progress of identifying and designating quality agricultural land as "Agricultural Priority Areas" ("APAs"). AD(A)/AFCD advised that AFCD had commissioned a consultancy study on APAs, which included identification of relatively large areas of quality agricultural land, and exploring suitable policies and measures to encourage landowners to put fallow farmland into long term agricultural use. The consultant was currently reviewing existing legislative requirements and quality of farmland in Hong Kong, and studying relevant overseas experience. Based on the outcome and recommendations of the consultancy study, the Government would consult the relevant stakeholders when appropriate. DAFC and AD(A)/AFCD said that given the considerable amount of agricultural land and complexity of issues involved, it was estimated that the consultancy study would take two to three years to complete.

Dr CHEUNG urged the Administration to complete the consultancy study as soon as possible.

91. At about 6:26 pm, the Chairman said that the Committee would proceed to consider the motions proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure at the next meeting to be held on 2 July 2020, after the remaining members who had indicated at the current meeting to speak on item FCR(2020-21)20 had spoken.

92. The meeting ended at 6:31 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
16 December 2020

財務委員會

**在 2020 年 6 月 30 日的會議上
根據《財務委員會會議程序》第 37A 段
就議程項目 FCR(2020-21)6 通過的議案**

政府要求本委員會撥款 200 億元用以購置物業，以提供福利設施。本委員會促請政府成立獨立督導委員會，包括獨立人士和服務使用者代表，監察購置的工作，以避免出現托市、貪污，或用過高價格購買等浪費公帑的情況出現。

動議人：張超雄議員

(Translation)

Finance Committee

**Motion passed under paragraph 37A of the
Finance Committee Procedure in relation to
agenda item FCR(2020-21)6 at the meeting on 30 June 2020**

Regarding the Government seeking this Committee's funding approval for a financial commitment of \$20 billion for the purchase of premises for the provision of welfare facilities, this Committee urges the Government to establish an independent steering committee to monitor the procurement exercise, which should comprise independent persons and representatives of service users, with a view to forestalling various scenarios that might result in a waste of public funds, such as acts that aim to boost the property market, corrupt practices, or the procurement of premises at excessively high prices, etc.

Moved by : Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

點名表決 DIVISION: 1
日期 DATE: 30/06/2020
時間 TIME: 04:01:33 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 本委員會同意處理委員根據《財務委員會會議程序》第 37A 段擬動議的議案
That this Committee should proceed with the motion proposed to be moved by a member under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 35
投票 Vote : 34
 贊成 Yes : 18
 反對 No : 16
 棄權 Abstain : 0
結果 Result : 通過 Passed

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

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

