

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)731/19-20

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/EDEV

Panel on Economic Development

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 20 January 2020, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 2 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan (Chairman)
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP
Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

Members attending : Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon KWONG Chun-yu

Members absent : Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin

Public Officers attending : Agenda item III
Commerce and Economic Development Bureau

Mr Edward YAU, GBS, JP
Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development

Miss Eliza LEE, JP
Permanent Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development (Commerce, Industry and Tourism)

Mr Joe WONG, JP
Commissioner for Tourism

Mr Anson LAI
Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2

Related organization : Agenda item III
Ocean Park Corporation

Mr Leo KUNG, GBS, JP
Chairman

Mr LAU Ming-wai, GBS, JP
Deputy Chairman

Mr Matthias LI
Chief Executive

Ms Celine CHEUNG
Executive Director, Design and Planning

Clerk in attendance: Ms Shirley CHAN
Chief Council Secretary (4)5

Staff in attendance : Ms Shirley TAM
Senior Council Secretary (4)5

Ms Lauren LI
Council Secretary (4)5

Ms Zoe TONG
Legislative Assistant (4)5

Miss Mandy LUI
Clerical Assistant (4)5

Action

I. Information papers issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper Nos. CB(4)198/19-20(01) — Letter from Hon WU Chi-wai
and CB(4)246/19-20(01) dated 12 December 2019 on
suggestions to restrain the
expansion of the capital assets
of the two power companies
and (Chinese version only) and
the Administration's response

LC Paper No. CB(4)223/19-20(01) — Airport Authority Hong Kong's
information paper on update on
the development of the
three-runway system at the
Hong Kong International
Airport

LC Paper No. CB(4)225/19-20(01) — Administration's response to the
letter from Hon SHIU Ka-chun

dated 9 December 2019 on 2020 electricity tariff review and electricity charges subsidy for non-residential customers as set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)187/19-20(01)

LC Paper No. CB(4)230/19-20(01) — Administration's paper on tables and graphs showing the import and retail prices of major oil products from December 2017 to November 2019

LC Paper No. CB(4)241/19-20(01) — Letter from Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho dated 6 January 2020 on the Airport Construction Fee under the financial arrangement plan for the construction of the three-runway system at Hong Kong International Airport (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(4)242/19-20(01) — Letter from Hon Charles Peter MOK dated 7 January 2020, which was addressed to the Hong Kong Tourism Board and copied to the Panel, on issues relating to Hong Kong New Year Countdown Lucky Draw (Chinese version only)

Members noted the above papers issued since the last regular meeting.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(4)257/19-20(01) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(4)257/19-20(02) — List of follow-up actions)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 24 February 2020 at 10:45 am –

- (a) Hong Kong Tourism Board Work Plan for 2020-2021; and
- (b) Statutory cooling-off period for beauty and fitness services consumer contracts.

(Post-meeting note: Members were informed via LC Paper No. CB(4)334/19-20 dated 19 February 2020 that on consideration of the latest situation of the COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong, the Chairman decided to reschedule the above meeting to a later date.)

III. Strategic Repositioning Plan of Ocean Park

(LC Paper No. CB(4)254/19-20(01) — Administration's paper on Strategic Repositioning Plan of Ocean Park and proposed financial arrangements

LC Paper No. CB(4)257/19-20(03) — Paper on the developments of Ocean Park prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief))

Presentation by the Administration and the Ocean Park Corporation

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development ("SCED") briefed members on the Strategic Repositioning Plan ("the SRP") of Ocean Park ("the Park") and proposed financial arrangements for supporting and revitalizing the Park ("the proposals"). The proposals comprised (a) financial arrangements in relation to the two Government loans pertaining to the Master Redevelopment Plan Project ("the MRP Project") and the Tai Shue Wan Development Project ("the TSWD Project"), and (b) provision of a one-off endowment of \$10.64 billion to the Park. With the aid of the powerpoint presentation materials, Mr Leo KUNG, Chairman of the Ocean Park Corporation ("OPC") and Ms Celine CHEUNG, Executive Director, Design and Planning of OPC briefed members on the SRP. Details of the SRP and the proposed financial arrangements were set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)254/19-20(01).

(*Post-meeting note:* The powerpoint presentation material provided by OPC was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)275/19-20(01) on 21 January 2020.)

Discussion

The SRP and proposed financial arrangements

4. Mr YIU Si-wing stressed the value and contributions of the Park to the economy, tourism and conservation of Hong Kong over the past decades. He considered it necessary to reposition the Park to face severe competition and avoid the closure of OPC due to financial distress. Nevertheless, he enquired about the rationale for providing a large amount of one-off endowment at \$10.64 billion to OPC under the proposals, whether the money would be used to repay OPC's outstanding loans, and the long-term sustainability of the Park under the SRP.

5. SCED said that it was envisaged that the SRP could increase the attendance of the Park from 5.0 million in Financial Year ("FY") 2022-23 to 7.5 million in FY 2027-28, thereby bringing in sufficient revenue to help the Park finance its investment for the future. Only by doing so would OPC be able to re-finance its existing commercial loans and defer their repayment or obtain any further financial support from commercial lenders to resolve the current predicament. Mr Leo KUNG of OPC supplemented that the SRP was formulated through a robust process and the total cost for implementing the SRP was estimated by the consultant engaged by OPC. OPC envisaged that the SRP would enable the Park to achieve long term financial sustainability and projected that the value-added contribution of the Park for the coming ten years (starting from FY 2020-21) in total would exceed \$43.8 billion (in 2019 prices).

6. On repaying OPC's outstanding loans, Mr LAU Ming-wai, Deputy Chairman of OPC said that it was proposed to allow OPC to make use of part of the one-off endowment (with a ceiling of \$1.5 billion) to provide short term cash reserve to fund the operation of the Park in the immediate term to prevent it from facing cash shortage and avoid additional interest payments aggravating its financial distress. Based on OPC's projection, even if \$1.5 billion were deployed in entirety from the one-off endowment for tiding over its interim cash flow shortage, it should still be able to implement the SRP in full using the total amount of the endowment applied as the attendance and revenue would increase once attractions proposed under the SRP come on stream by phases and the increased revenue could be ploughed back to fund the construction of the remaining facilities of the SRP.

7. Mr WONG Ting-kwong said that the Park formed part of collective memory of Hong Kong people and it was rather regrettable to close it down due to financial problems. However, he was concerned about the business and financial viability of OPC after receiving the one-off endowment, in particular, whether OPC could make ends meet and achieve the projected attendance in YR 2027-28. He also enquired about the basis of OPC's projection on the outstanding loan balance amounting to \$8,063 million by FY 2028-29.

8. Commissioner for Tourism explained that the said loan balance was projected by OPC based on the total outstanding amount of the two Government loans by end of FY 2028-29 assuming the interest rates remained unchanged. The original loan amounts were \$1,387.5 million (the MRP Project approved in 2005) and \$2,290 million (the TSWD Project approved in 2013) while the difference in total would be the accumulated interests.

9. Expressing reservations about the proposals, Mr Jeremy TAM criticized the poor finance of OPC which was required to repay two Government loans commencing in FY 2021-22 while all of its assets had been made collateral of the MRP Project and could not be used to back further commercial loans. Given the huge size of OPC's outstanding debts and its impending insolvency, he raised concern about the financial viability of OPC. Mr TAM also enquired if the delayed completion of the new waterpark under the TSWD Project since 2017 had further aggravated the financial situation of OPC and requested OPC to provide information on the overrun costs of the TSWD Project comparing with the original budget at \$2.29 billion.

10. Mr Leo KUNG of OPC said that the OPC's performance since 2003 had reflected its ability to recover from adverse situation after receiving the Government's financial support for the MRP Project. Mr Matthias LI, Chief Executive of OPC supplemented that the TSWD Project which included an all-weather waterpark was an important and challenging project for OPC. Due to the site issues, its construction works was still underway while the cost had reached some \$3.7 billion.

11. Mr Jeremy TAM considered that the rapid recovery of OPC since 2003 was due to the leadership of Mr Allan ZEMAN who managed to raise the Park's attendance and turned the deficit into surplus in subsequent years. However, OPC had recorded deficits again since the stepping down of Mr ZEMAN from 2014.

12. Mrs Regina IP opined that the Park was able to achieve a high attendance in previously years mainly attributed to the surge of Mainland visitors under the Individual Visit Scheme. However, the number of Mainland visitors had turned into a downward trend amidst a series of unpleasant incidents against tourists, recent social unrest as well as the openings of various theme parks in the Mainland. Considering that there was no guarantee that the SRP would not have cost overruns or delay and that the projected Park's attendance could certainly be met, she expressed reservations about the proposals. Mrs IP considered it inappropriate to position the Park as a tourism facility which was inconsistent with the Ocean Park Corporation Ordinance (Cap. 388) ("the Ordinance"), and urged the Administration/OPC to work out an alternative plan to support the operation of the Park. She also enquired about OPC's cash flow to sustain its survival if the proposals were rejected.

13. Mr Leo KUNG of OPC replied that OPC would deplete its cash balance by end of 2020 according to current estimation. Mr Matthias LI of OPC supplemented that OPC had some \$400 million cash in hand. SCED said that the financial situation of the Park was indeed critical. The recent social incidents had led to an unprecedented steep increase in the Park's loss. However, the Park was highly welcomed by visitors and was ranked the sixth most visited attraction in Hong Kong by overnight visitors. Hence, instead of closing down the business, the Administration put forward the proposals to inject impetus into the Park and help it to attract a more diverse range of visitors to avoid reliance on a single visitor source market.

14. Mr Michael TIEN said that he would support the proposals if the Park was regarded as a public facility requiring Government's funding instead of a commercial theme park. Pointing out the Park's decline in attendance versus the Hong Kong Disneyland Resort ("HKDL")'s rise from 2016 to 2018, Mr TIEN considered that the OPC Board should review its business strategies to ensure the sustainable operation and attractiveness of the Park. He also called on the OPC management team to strengthen its cost management to improve the financial position of OPC.

15. SCED responded that the SRP should not be treated as public works as the OPC was not a Government department but a statutory body governed by the Ordinance. The unsatisfactory attendance rate of the Park was due to the severe competition in the region, while ageing facilities as well as changes in visitor mix had intensified the challenge. To eliminate its financial pressure in the long-term, OPC had been reminded to stringently control, in particular, the capital and operation costs of the Park. Mr Matthias LI of OPC supplemented

that OPC had delivered growth in in-park spending during 2018-2019 which had led to an increased demand for human resources.

16. Mr Alvin YEUNG cast doubt if it was worth to inject a huge sum of public money into OPC which was already in deficit since YR 2015-16. He also enquired if the Administration was satisfied with the OPC's management performance. Although OPC would only be allowed to deploy the maximum of \$1.5 billion of the one-off endowment for tiding over its interim cash flow shortage under the SRP, he was worried about the consequences if OPC still could not repay its loans and obligations afterwards.

17. Mr Kenneth LEUNG enquired about the uniqueness of the Park as compared with HKDL and other theme parks worldwide that were worthy of the Government's financial support to this extent. He also requested the information on a long-term financing model to guarantee OPC's ability to achieve self-sustainability based on the SRP and the financial arrangements without requiring Government's further support. To improve OPC's performance, Mr LEUNG suggested restructuring the OPC Board to include more full-time dedicated members.

18. SCED replied that the OPC's management performance would be evaluated by its Board of Directors. The Administration acknowledged the efforts paid by the OPC management team to counteract the severe challenges coming up in recent years. Under the Ordinance, the OPC Board was the governing body of OPC while the OPC management team was responsible for the day to day management and administration of the Park. The OPC Board comprised members from different sectors and its composition would be reviewed from time to time to include experts of different professions having regard to the needs and challenges arising then.

19. Mr Leo KUNG of OPC advised that OPC had recorded growth in its revenue, but its increased expenditure such as interest and depreciation costs had outweighed the growth in revenue. Mr LAU Ming-wai of OPC said that the SRP proposed to reposition the Park into an adventure-themed resort destination grounded in nature and conservation. It targeted to bring in family visitors of all ages by constructing a series of new attractions together with upgrading or refurbishment of existing ones. He was confident that OPC with the implementation of the SRP would achieve long-term sustainability by providing different kinds of experiences to visitors which would cater for their latest taste and expectation.

20. The Deputy Chairman was of the view that the Park had been unsuitably developed into a tourism attraction instead of a public recreational and educational park according to the Ordinance. Pointing out that the Park had been provided with Government loans for redevelopment in the past and now the Park required further financial support from the Government to replace its outdated facilities, he considered it difficult for the Park to compete with HKDL and other neighbouring theme parks which had more financial resources. He also cast doubt on OPC's ability to repay its various loans and interests as well as other expenses and depreciation costs in the long term, and sought information on the basis of OPC's projection that the forecast revenue brought by the attendance growth under the SRP would be sufficient to meet all the expenditure required.

21. SCED replied that the Park had to fulfill the public recreational and educational purposes as specified in the Ordinance. It welcomed both local visitors and tourists with local visitors accounting for some 45%. The Park had also provided rich and diversified educational content and programmes in which over one million students had taken part. Mr LAU Ming-wai of OPC added that based on various assessments, OPC was confident that the proposals would allow OPC to accumulate sufficient reserve for repaying the loans starting from 2029.

22. Expressing objection to the proposals, Ms Claudia MO queried the rationale for providing the one-off endowment of \$10.64 billion to OPC which was more than the money incurred for the livelihood initiatives announced by the Chief Executive in January 2020. She criticized that ocean animals in the Park were kept in captivity, and that the Park was more targeted to Mainland visitors than local people which only accounted for 45% in the total attendance. She also considered it undesirable that some of the Park's activities seemed to be under political censorship.

23. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen objected to the proposals and considered the new attractions under the SRP not attractive. Expressing disappointment at the delay in opening the waterpark under the TSWD Project, he wondered if any commercial lenders would provide financial support to OPC having regard to its unfavorable financial situation. He also raised concern on the imposition of political censorship on the Park's activities which seemed to be against the will of many Hong Kong people.

24. SCED replied that while the Park was a Hong Kong brand with more than 40 years of iconic history, it should not mean that only locals would be

allowed to enjoy the Park. Among different options to help the Park out of financial difficulties, instead of providing recurrent subsidy or another loan associated with interest payments, the Administration proposed to provide a one-off endowment to reduce the financial pressure on OPC. It was also suitable for the Park to construct new attractions and facilities to enhance its attractiveness and competitiveness, thereby ensuring that the Park would achieve a fiscal balance in the long run.

25. On animal's rights, Mr LAU Ming-wai of OPC responded that the Park was widely recognized by its efforts in animal care. The OPC Board had been constantly reviewing the Park's activities in this regard, and making enormous contributions to scientific research leading to enhanced conservation and animal care. Under the SRP, the Park would steer away from conventional animal shows and would focus its animal exhibits and displays on environmental protection, marine conservation and education. The animal exhibitory would more resemble the natural habitat and diverse multi-species systems.

Alternative approaches

26. Mr CHU Hoi-dick expressed reservations on the proposals and considered the projected benefits brought by the SRP too optimistic. He cast doubt on the appropriateness for the Government to make a huge investment on a theme park, and suggested the Administration to explore other options such as scaling down the Park, closing it down and using the land for other purposes, or selling the Park to other global operators.

27. SCED remarked that many Hong Kong people were in favour of rescuing the Park instead of closing it down. However, it would be very challenging for OPC to secure a buyer of the Park having regard to its dismal financial situation. Meanwhile, the purpose of the SRP was not about expanding the Park to a grandiose scale, but to revitalize its attractions leveraging on the existing advantages. To facilitate members' consideration, Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to provide examples of overseas governments supporting local theme parks with substantial amounts of public money.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)343/19-20(01) on 21 February 2020.)

28. Mr Holden CHOW said that with its long history in Hong Kong, the Park was a well-liked local brand cherished by the Hong Kong people. Having

regard to the large amount of public money involved in the proposals, the financial deficits of OPC recorded in recent years, the delay completion of the new waterpark under the TSWD Project coupled with the intensifying competition among theme parks in the region, it was difficult for Members to support the proposals. He suggested the Administration put forward a short-term emergency plan to help OPC out of immediate financial difficulties. He was of the view that a large-scale development of the Park could be explored after a thorough discussion and an internal reform of OPC.

29. Sharing a similar view, Ms Elizabeth QUAT said that she was not fully convinced that the SRP could substantially increase the attendance of the Park as there might be a drop in Mainland visitor arrivals in the coming years. Even though the projected attendance under the SRP could be met, she was unsure whether OPC could generate sufficient revenue in future to sustain the Park's operation and make a profit. Relaying the public view that the one-off endowment of \$10.64 billion under the proposals could be put into other better use, she enquired if the Administration could offer other alternatives to help the Park. She also requested the Administration to provide detailed analysis to support its proposals.

30. SCED explained that the proposals sought to help the Park tide over its immediate financial difficulties as well as to enable it to be repositioned through investing in developing, expanding and improving facilities, and hence revitalizing its attractions and bringing in more visitors so as to sustain its survival in the long run. Although OPC was encountering financial distress, the Park was still rolling out new activities/attractions from time to time including the recently launched night time multi-media light show and the waterpark which would be completed in 2020.

31. Mr Leo KUNG of OPC advised that OPC was under continuous reform with evolving business strategies and staging different events to draw visitors. To enhance the Park's attractiveness and competitiveness, a new capital investment was needed for constructing new attractions and upgrading the existing facilities. Mr LAU Ming-wai of OPC added that the \$10.64 billion would be used to develop new attractions while the existing facilities would be upgraded and improved in parallel, to give a new look of the Park to visitors. This change would parallel the restructuring of the whole tourism sector of Hong Kong from the previous shopping paradise into a new era.

32. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that it was difficult for Members to support the proposals due to the poor business performance of OPC and strong competition

faced by the Park from HKDL and other neighbouring counterparts like the Sea World Shenzhen which offered larger amusement areas at lower entrance fees. Instead of direct competition with theme parks in the region and to better utilize the public money, he requested the Administration/OPC to provide a detailed plan to strengthen the Park's role as a public education and conservation infrastructure with scientific research facilities on ocean animals.

33. Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that the Government had been providing support to OPC for years by providing land, transportation facilities and loans. Without settling the previous outstanding loans, he considered it difficult to persuade Members and the public to support the proposals which involved enormous amount of money. To resolve the current predicament faced by the Park, he called on the Administration to put forward alternative financial proposals with sufficient details to convince the public and Members.

34. SCED replied that in face of the critical situation of the Park, the Administration considered that the SRP with the associated funding arrangements was the most suitable option which struck a good balance to relieve OPC's financial situation as well as revive the Park by capitalizing on its existing advantages and potentials. Mr Leo KUNG of OPC said that the consultancies engaged had conducted an 18-month study to work out the SRP, during which locals and target visitors from various countries were surveyed. The SRP was designed featuring the Park's unique geography and topography. He assured members that OPC would strive to enhance the Park's attractiveness and push for more education and conservation work.

Motions

35. Members noted that two motions were to be moved under this agenda item. The Chairman ruled that these motions were directly related to the agenda item under discussion. Members agreed that the two motions should be dealt with at the meeting. As directed by the Chairman, the voting bell was rung for five minutes.

Motion moved by Mr Jeremy TAM

36. Mr Jeremy TAM moved the following motion –

"根據內務守則第 22P 條，本人動議：

海洋公園因為經營不善，而導致公園自 2015 年起便開始錄得

嚴重虧損，若然公司無能力改善其經營問題，貿然向公園撥款會令政府陷入財政上的"無底深潭"；因此，本委員會要求政府撤換海洋公園公司董事局成員，改革公司管理架構，讓能者居之，改變本來用人唯親的陋習；撤換董事局成員及管理層後，政府可暫緩兩筆政府貸款的還款期 5 年，以待海洋公園新管治團隊改善其經營不善問題；若然新管治團隊認為需要提出新發展計劃，屆時才是適合討論項目的時候。"

(Translation)

"Under Rule 22P of the House Rules, I hereby move the following motion:

The Ocean Park Corporation ("OPC") has recorded serious deficits since 2015 due to its poor management. If OPC is incapable of addressing its management problem, the rashly allocation of public funds to OCP will make the Government fall into a "bottomless pit" financially. Therefore, this Panel calls on the Government to remove the incumbent Board members of OPC and reform its corporate governance structure so as to enable those who are competent to join the Board, thereby changing the undesirable practice of cronyism that OPC has been adopting. After the removal of the Board members and the management, the repayment of the two Government loans by OPC could be suspended for five years to allow time for the new management team to address the problem of poor management. By then, if the new management team considers it necessary to propose any new development plans, it would be an appropriate time to commence the discussion."

37. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Five members voted for and eight members voted against the motion, and a member abstained from voting. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai (Deputy Chairman), Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Jeremy TAM
(5 members)

Against:

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mrs Regina IP, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG,

Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Dr Junius HO, Mr SHIU Ka-fai
(8 members)

Abstained from voting:

Mr Kenneth LEUNG
(1 member)

38. The Chairman declared that the motion was negated.

Motion moved by Mr YIU Si-wing

39. Mr YIU Si-wing moved the following motion –

"鑒於海洋公園近年面對周邊地區主題公園的競爭，加上目前遊樂設施缺乏吸引力，以致經營和財政狀況出現困難。為了維持海洋公園持續的競爭力，政府有責任作出支援。

本會支持政府撥款，以解決海洋公園的全新定位策略和發展計劃，但由於部分數據未能釋除委員的疑慮，本會要求政府及海洋公園，在撥款提交財務委員會審議時，進一步交代如何有效運用撥款，包括使用範圍以及新設施落成後的效益評估等。"

(Translation)

"Ocean Park has been facing operating and financial difficulties due to competition from theme parks in the neighbouring region in recent years and the unattractiveness of its existing amusement facilities. The Government has the responsibility to provide support to Ocean Park to sustain its competitiveness.

This Panel supports the provision of Government funding to take forward the strategic repositioning and development plan of Ocean Park. However, as some of the statistics cannot allay members' concern, this Panel requests the Government and Ocean Park, in their submission of the funding proposal to the Finance Committee for consideration, to further explain how the funds could be effectively used, including their usage and an assessment of the benefits of the new facilities upon their completion."

40. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Seven members voted for and five members voted against the motion. No member abstained from voting. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Dr Junius HO, Mr SHIU Ka-fai
(7 members)

Against:

Mrs Regina IP, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai (Deputy Chairman), Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Jeremy TAM
(5 members)

41. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response to the motion was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)343/19-20(02) on 21 February 2020.)

Voting

42. The Chairman noted the divergent views of members. At members' request, the Chairman put to vote the question that the Panel supported the SRP put forward by OPC. Six members voted for and four members voted against the question. No member abstained from voting. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr YIU Si-wing, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Dr Junius HO, Mr SHIU Ka-fai
(6 members)

Against:

Mr WU Chi-wai (Deputy Chairman), Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Jeremy TAM
(4 members)

43. After the Chairman announced the voting result, Mrs Regina IP asked to put on record that she intended to vote against the question. Mr Christopher CHEUNG also requested to put on record that he intended to vote for the question.

44. The Chairman concluded that the Panel supported the SRP.

45. Due to time constraints, the Chairman decided after consulting members at the meeting that the discussion of "Permanent set-up and staffing proposals of Air Accident Investigation Authority" as listed under agenda IV of this meeting be deferred to the next regular meeting.

46. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:18 pm.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
19 June 2020