

**Minutes of the Second Meeting of  
Central and Western District Council**

**Date** : 16 January 2020 (Thursday)  
**Time** : 2:00 pm  
**Venue** : Conference Room  
14/F., Harbour Building  
38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

**Present:**

Chairman

Ms CHENG Lai-king\*

Vice-chairman

Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor\*

Members

Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin\*

Mr HO Chi-wang\*

Mr HUI Chi-fung (2:00 pm – 10:35 pm)

Mr KAM Nai-wai, MH\*

Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus\*

Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie\*

Mr NG Siu-hong\*

Mr PANG Ka-ho\*

Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry\*

Mr WONG Weng-chi\*

Miss YAM Ka-yi\*

Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam\*

Mr YOUNG Chit-on, Jeremy (2:07 pm – 9:53 pm)

Remarks: \* Members who attended the whole meeting  
( ) Time of attendance of Members

**Item 5**

Ms BOOK King-shun, Emma

Executive Officer I (District Council), Central and Western District Office

**Item 6**

Mr TANG Ping-keung, PDSM

Mr TSE Ming-yeung

Commissioner of Police, Hong Kong Police Force  
District Commander (Central District), Hong Kong Police Force

Ms WONG Siu-hing, Queenie

District Commander (Western District), Hong Kong Police Force

**Item 7**

Mr MAN Chi-wah

Mr CHAN Chit-kwai, Stephen

Representative of the public

Representative of the public

**Item 8**

Mr HO Wing-hong, Ernest

Mr Rico WONG

Miss Lilian YEUNG

Manager - External Affairs, MTR Corporation Limited  
Operations Manager - Island Line, South Island Line & Tseung Kwan O Line, MTR Corporation Limited  
Public Relations Manager - External Affairs, MTR Corporation Limited

**Item 10**

Mr WONG Hung-tak

Mr CHEUNG Chiu-tun

Representative, Wisdom Regeneration

Representative, Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town

**Item 12(i)**

Mr Wilfred AU

Mr Christopher WONG

Ms Michelle TONG

Ms Sarah YUN

Ms Katty LAW

Director (Planning and Design), Urban Renewal Authority  
General Manager (Planning and Design), Urban Renewal Authority

Senior Manager (Acquisition and Clearance), Urban Renewal Authority

Senior Manager (Community Development), Urban Renewal Authority

Convenor, Central and Western Concern Group

**Item 12(ii)**

Ms Anita LO

Ms Katty LAW

Head of Facilities Management, The Jockey Club CPS Limited

Convenor, Central and Western Concern Group

**Item 16**

Mr LEE Tin-chi, Cario

Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Central and Western District Office

**In Attendance:**

Mr TSE Ming-yeung	District Commander (Central District), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms WONG Siu-hing, Queenie	District Commander (Western District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr TSAI Tung-hung	Police Community Relations Officer (Central District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr YU Kong	Police Community Relations Officer (Western District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHU Yiu-chow, James	Acting Chief Engineer/South 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Ms FUNG Miu-ling	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr AU Siu-fung, Kelvin	Senior Transport Officer/Central & Western, Transport Department
Mrs WONG HO Wing-sze, Susanne, JP	District Officer (Central and Western)
Miss WONG Sze-ki, Carol	Assistant District Officer (Central and Western)
Mr MOK Chi-kin, Jiv	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Central and Western District Office
Ms BOOK King-shun, Emma	Executive Officer I (District Council), Central and Western District Office

**Secretary**

Ms YEUNG Wing-shan, Grace	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Central and Western District Office
---------------------------	--

## **Opening Remarks**

(2:00 pm – 2:13 pm)

The Chairman welcomed all to the second meeting of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC). She said that there were quite a number of items on the agenda and proposed that each Member be given two minutes to speak each time to facilitate efficient discussion. Second round follow-up questions and comments by Members would depend on the availability of time. She appealed to Members for cooperation and reminded Members to declare interests as necessary and appropriate. She would also like to remind meeting participants that pursuant to section 6(5) of the Central and Western District Council Standing Orders (Standing Orders), items included in the agenda should be compatible with the functions of the Council as laid down in section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance, and the Chairman should ensure this be done as required by the Standing Orders.

2. The Chairman also said that due to the presence of a large number of people today, participants were requested to keep quiet to facilitate the orderly conduct of the meeting. In case heckling or chaos arose, reminder would be given to the persons concerned by the Chairman. After two reminders had been given, if the chaotic situation continued and proceedings of the Council were disrupted, the Chairman might ask those who caused disturbance to leave the conference room. Besides, participants should be mindful of their language and should refrain from personal attacks or insults to avoid undermining the image of the Council. The Chairman also indicated that parties attending the meeting included C&WDC Members (carrying District Council Member Cards), media reporters (issued with press cards), assistants to C&WDC Members (issued with assistant's badges), and observers (issued with visitor badges). She hoped that all participants would display their respective identification document. She also asked the police officers present to display their warrant cards in order to let the public know that they were plainclothes police officers. She said that some Members had just complained to her that some meeting participants were of unknown identity. She reiterated her hope for all police officers present to identify themselves by displaying their warrant cards. She understood that police officers might need to be on standby as the Commissioner of Police would attend this meeting. However, she said that today's meeting was peaceful, non-violent as well as solemn. She hoped that all participants would observe the rules, otherwise they would be asked to leave.

3. Mr KAM Nai-wai hoped that the police commanders present would take the lead to display their warrant cards, remarking that the Chairman had asked all plainclothes police officers present to produce their warrant cards. He continued that if any plainclothes police officer failed to produce his warrant card in entering the conference room, the police commanders present should be held responsible for this and the police officer concerned would be required to leave. (The Chairman requested all police officers present to display their

warrant cards. Some observers made noise in the public gallery. The Chairman indicated that as said earlier, she would issue reminder to those who made noise. If, after two reminders had been given, the chaotic situation continued and disrupted the proceedings of the meeting, she might ask those who caused the chaos to leave. She said this was the first reminder issued.)

4. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received before the meeting a request from Mr KAM Nai-wai for making an oral statement. Pursuant to section 26 of the Standing Orders, any statement and question put to a meeting of the Council must be compatible with the functions of the Council. Pursuant to section 30 of the Standing Orders, a member who wished to make an oral statement should inform the Secretary before the meeting, but the oral statement should not take more than five minutes. She invited Mr KAM Nai-wai to make the oral statement.

5. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that this was the second meeting of the new term C&WDC at which the Council formally started to discuss social issues of public concern. He hoped to use this statement to share his aspirations for serving as Member of the new term. He said that he had visited Taiwan earlier to witness its election, in which Ms TSAI Ing-wen was re-elected President of the Republic of China by amassing 8.17 million votes. In her victory speech, Ms TSAI said that the most beautiful scenery of Taiwan was its young people. Looking back at Hong Kong, Mr KAM said that the SAR Government, being a puppet of the Beijing government and had betrayed Hong Kong people, held the belief that "being young was a sin". More than 7 000 people had been arrested, many of them were young people. He said that many young people had been elected members of the new term District Councils (DCs), which was the best response from Hong Kong society to the puppet SAR Government's disregard for the demands of society and young people. During the election process, many people he did not know encouraged him by saying "Go for it", and a few citizens asked him whether he supported violence. He referred to himself as "peaceful, rational and non-violent", and it was thus very clear that he was against violence. He would like to quote an article of Mr AU Ka-lun, which said "There is a process for the radicalisation of protest. On the one hand, peaceful demonstrations are being disregarded; independent investigation is not conducted; and loud demand expressed in a civilised manner through the electoral system is not being listened. Instead, the Administration plays up the violence of protesters; the Police never miss an opportunity to put on a show whenever suspected firearms are seized; and government advertisements advocating 'Say no to violence' are broadcasted every day in an attempt to brainwash people. But they never reflect on the fact that they themselves is the root cause of violence: violence inherited in the parliamentary system, institutional violence, violence associated with DQ (disqualification of candidates at LegCo/DC elections), police brutality, exploitation of the law as a tool of political oppression, means of punishing dissidents. Citizens of all levels are being attacked on all fronts. Please say no to violence." Mr KAM said that this article reflected what he had in mind. He indicated that in the recent DC Election,

he received nearly twice as many votes as in the previous term. He believed that apart from those residents who gave recognition to his district work, many more were residents who supported the promotional slogan "Liberate Hong Kong, Your Vote Counts" he chanted at the final stage of the election. He said that he had submitted a paper on "Stop police violence and restore calm to Hong Kong" for discussion at the meeting. He said that a police state was unwanted as it would put citizens at risk, and he would honor his election pledges. He believed that as a first step in liberating Hong Kong, apart from stopping police brutality and reforming the police force, it was necessary to set up an independent commission of inquiry to thoroughly look into the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments (the movement). It was not the independent review committee as mentioned by the Chief Executive, which was merely passing off the sham as the genuine. Instead, the independent commission of inquiry should investigate the illegal acts of the Police in events including the "612 incident", "721 incident", and "831 incident". He remarked that liberating Hong Kong was to make Hong Kong a free, just and safe society again. He said that over the past six months or so, the puppet SAR Government's attempt to use the Police to solve political problems had instead given rise to problems with the force itself. He remarked that in the morning of this meeting day, the Chief Executive said she did not accept the claim that police brutality existed in Hong Kong in the past seven months, reflecting that the problem lied with the Chief Executive herself. As the matter now stood, it was even more unlikely to be resolved easily. The SAR Government announced days ago that it would allocate \$800 million for implementing 10 initiatives to improve people's livelihood, in hope of solving political problems by distributing money. He quoted the words of Mr KWAN Cheuk-chiu, an economist, that "The Government is shameless in using its people's money to solve its own problems." He expressed support for introducing relief measures, but reckoned that the failure of the puppet SAR Government to respond to the five key demands, including establishment of an independent commission of inquiry, was the root of the problem. Lastly, he said he had previously proposed that reform of the Council should start from giving priority to community-led services, as well as putting issues like municipal affairs and town planning on the agenda for discussion to stimulate thinking and encourage discussion. He hoped that the new term Council could be reformed to become more down to earth under the driving force of young people. He also said that in addition to fulfilling his election pledges on political issues, he would continue to strive for the setting up of a Sheung Wan Library and alleviating problems in the areas of transport, environment, etc. He hoped that "Five Demands, Not One Less" could be fulfilled, and that residents would monitor his work and give comments.

6. The Chairman said that the new term Council comprised 14 elected members belonging to the pan-democratic camp. They all adopted the motto "Five Demands, Not One Less" in the election. There were also items on the meeting agenda about issues arising from the movement, which would be discussed one by one.

### **Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda**

(2:13 pm – 2:15 pm)

7. The Chairman asked whether Members had any views on the agenda (further revised). Also, she said that the item “Oppose to the proposed eating place at the portion of public viewing area and a corridor adjacent to Shop L on public viewing deck level (2/F) of Central Pier No.7 (Star Ferry) (Application No. A/H24/25)” would not be discussed at today’s meeting if the Town Planning Board was to defer consideration of the application for two months.

8. There being no further comment from Members, the Chairman declared the adoption of the agenda.

### **Item 2: Confirmation of the Minutes of the First C&WDC Meeting held on 2 January 2020**

(2:15 pm – 2:16 pm)

9. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had sent the draft minutes of the first C&WDC meeting to Members on 13 January 2020 by e-mail. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposal to the draft minutes from Members before the meeting. Members had no comment on the draft minutes of the first meeting and the Chairman declared that the minutes were confirmed.

### **Item 3: Action Checklist on Matters Arising from the First C&WDC Meeting** **(C&W DC Paper No. 13/2020)**

(2:16 pm – 2:17 pm)

10. Members noted the progress of follow-up of different items in the action checklist. The Secretary said that the Secretariat received, in the morning of this meeting day, a written reply from the Highways Department on the item “Matters concerning the installation of fences on the footbridge connecting Eastern Street and Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park” in the action checklist. The written reply would be circulated for Members’ reference as soon as possible.

#### **Item 4: Chairman's Report**

(2:17 pm)

11. The Chairman had nothing particular to highlight.

#### **Item 5: Standing Orders of C&WDC**

**(C&W DC Paper No. 01/2020)**

(2:17 pm – 2:40 pm)

12. The Chairman thanked Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, the Vice-chairman for taking up the chairmanship of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council (WG-SO). She also thanked Ms YEUNG Wing-shan, Senior Executive Officer and Ms BOOK King-shun, Executive Officer I of the Central and Western District Office (C&WDO) for amending the Standing Orders overnight.

13. The Vice-chairman said that WG-SO had at its first meeting endorsed the revised draft of the Standing Orders prepared by the Secretariat. Major changes included addition of provisions on moving impromptu motions and amendment of certain technical terms. He invited Ms BOOK King-shun of C&WDO to brief Members on it.

14. Ms BOOK King-shun of C&WDO said that WG-SO had endorsed the revised Standing Orders, which was prepared in accordance with the amendment proposals of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) and on the basis of the Standing Orders of the previous-term Council, and had endorsed the abolition of the proxy voting system. In addition, WG-SO had endorsed amendment to section 13(5) of the Standing Orders. Before amendment, section 13(5) provided that papers on a similar item submitted by different members for discussion should not be included in the agenda of the same meeting, and the paper submitted at a later time should be included as the appendix of the paper submitted at an earlier time. No motion should be included in an appendix of a paper. After amendment, papers on a similar item could be combined for discussion, and motion could be included in each of the papers. After combination, the papers would only take up a quota of the items for discussion at a meeting of the Council. Amendment had also been made to section 17 of the Standing Orders by referencing to the provisions on impromptu motions in the Kwai Tsing District Council Standing Orders. WG-SO had also endorsed the removal of the provisions on “appointment of co-opted members”. However, Ms BOOK pointed out that section 34(2) of the Standing Orders stated that “A District Council may appoint to a committee any person who is not a member of that Council to serve as co-opted member of the committee if the person satisfies the qualifications set out in section 20(1) of the District Councils Ordinance”. She worried that the Standing Orders would be inconsistent with the District Councils Ordinance if the



relevant provision was removed from the Standing Orders. She therefore wished to seek Members' views before making the amendment.

15. The Chairman invited discussion on the paper. Members' questions and comments were as follows:

- (a) Mr YIP Kam-lung reckoned that section 34(2) gave the Council the power to appoint co-opted members pursuant to the Standing Orders, and there were also relevant provisions in the District Councils Ordinance. Nevertheless, the removal of the provision in the Standing Orders by the C&WDC could demonstrate to the public and future Council members that the C&WDC would not appoint co-opted members, so he considered that sections 34(2) and 34(4) should be removed.
- (b) The Vice-chairman said that while the District Councils Ordinance gave DCs the power to appoint co-opted members, Members had at the first meeting resolved not to appoint co-opted members. Therefore, it was no longer necessary to have relevant provisions under the Standing Orders. He suggested that the provisions related to co-opted members should be removed to avoid confusion in the future.

16. Mrs WONG HO Wing-sze, District Officer (Central and Western) (DO(C&W)), added that for the sake of clarity and consistency, HAD would generally incorporate some legislations into standing orders. As mentioned by Mr YIP just now, the District Councils Ordinance gave DCs the power to appoint co-opted members, which meant they could choose whether or not to appoint co-opted members. Members could decide whether to retain the provisions on co-opted members in the Standing Orders.

17. The Vice-chairman said that it might not be necessary to follow HAD's recommendations. Since the provisions on co-opted members were no longer applicable, it was therefore not necessary to retain them to avoid making the Standing Orders too lengthy.

18. The Chairman invited further discussion on the paper. Members' questions and comments were as follows:

- (a) Mr YOUNG Chit-on said he disagreed with removing the provisions on co-opted members. He considered that the current-term Council could choose not to appoint co-opted members if they so decided, but there was no need to deliberately remove the provisions. This would save the need for future amendment should the next-term Council decided to revert to the practice of appointing co-opted members.

- (b) Mr YIP Kam-lung disagreed with the views of Mr YOUNG Chit-on, saying that if the provisions on co-opted members were not removed, both Members and the public would think that it was still possible to appoint co-opted members. He opined that since the current-term Council had decided not to appoint co-opted members, the relevant provisions should be removed to highlight this decision. He suggested that if the provisions on co-opted members were not to be removed, a remark that "the C&WDC would not appoint co-opted members" should be added at the end of the provisions. He continued that he would submit a paper later to request that any amendment to the Standing Orders required the consent of two-thirds of all Members to avoid frequent changes to the Standing Orders. He believed that good tradition should be upheld in order to inform the public how the C&WDC operated.
- (c) Miss YAM Ka-yi was in favour of removing the provisions on co-opted members. She said that this was not an attempt to amend the District Councils Ordinance, but simply not to include the relevant provisions in the Standing Orders. In short, the ordinance still existed but not applicable to the C&WDC, so the relevant provisions should be removed.
- (d) Mr HO Chi-wang supported the removal of section 34(2) and disagreed with the views of Mr YOUNG Chit-on. He worried that if the provisions on co-opted members were retained, the public might be misled to believe that co-opted members could still be appointed.
- (e) The Chairman shared Mr HO Chi-wang's view, remarking that it was concluded at the first meeting that the current-term Council would not appoint co-opted members and would only invite guests to attend its meetings.
- (f) Mr WONG Weng-chi suggested that the provisions on co-opted members should be removed, saying that the C&WDC should set a good example. The relevant provisions could be added back in case the next-term Council decided to appoint co-opted members.
- (g) The Vice-chairman said it was resolved at the first WG-SO meeting that all the provisions on co-opted members should be removed. He considered Mr YOUNG Chit-on's suggestion for saving time and convenience undesirable. He suggested that all the provisions on co-opted members should be removed for the sake of clarity.

19. The Chairman suggested that the Council should resolve on the removal of sections

34(2) and 34(4) of the Standing Orders. 14 Members were in favour of the removal of sections 34(2) and 34(4), while Mr YOUNG Chit-on was against it.

20. The Vice-chairman requested the Chairman to ask those plainclothes police officers who did not wear their warrant cards to leave the conference room. The Chairman requested all police officers to wear their warrant cards, and asked the police commanders to supervise their subordinates to comply with relevant rules.

21. DO(C&W) said that the amendments could be endorsed, but reminded that it might be necessary to consult HAD or other relevant institutions on certain details.

22. Mr YIP Kam-lung enquired whether the amendments should be put to vote pursuant to the agenda.

23. After a vote by show of hands, 15 Members were in favour of the latest amendments endorsed by WG-SO. The Chairman declared that the latest amendment proposals based on the C&WDC Standing Orders were endorsed and adopted as the Standing Orders of the current-term Council.

#### **Item 6: Meeting the Commissioner of Police**

(2:40 pm – 4:20 pm)

24. The Chairman welcomed Mr TANG Ping-keung, Commissioner of Police (CoP), Mr TSE Ming-yeung, District Commander (Central District) and Ms WONG Siu-hing, District Commander (Western District) of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) to the meeting.

25. The Chairman advised that the persons shouting out of the public gallery would be asked to leave the conference room if they continued to do so for causing disruption to the meeting.

26. The Vice-chairman said that that group of observers had been causing disruption repeatedly. He requested C&WDO staff to keep an eye on them.

27. The Chairman again stressed that persons attending meetings of the Council should behave in a cooperative manner. She would issue a final warning if the meeting was again disrupted and the relevant persons must leave the conference room at once.

28. Mr YIP Kam-lung raised a point of order. He remarked that some person had

left the public gallery and approached the meeting table just now to hand a petition letter to the Chairman, and he considered such an act inappropriate and procedurally not in order. He suggested that the Chairman should warn members of the public not to come close to the meeting table.

29. The Chairman agreed that it was inappropriate for members of the public to come close to the meeting table and hand in letters. The usual practice was that the Chairman would only accept letters after the meeting. But as that person had placed the letter right in front of her, she had no choice but to take it. The Chairman said that she was willing to receive petition letters, but solemnly reminded members of the public to observe meeting rules when handing petition letters.

30. The Chairman invited Mr TANG Ping-keung, CoP to take 10 minutes to brief Members on the work of HKPF. She said that each Member would have four minutes after the briefing, and hoped that CoP could reply right away after a Member finished asking questions each time. After CoP had given a reply, Members could ask follow-up questions within the four-minute time limit. Members of the public would only be arranged to speak when the meeting proceeded to the discussion items (i.e. from Item 7 onwards).

31. Mr TANG Ping-keung, CoP, said the Council had originally indicated that he could have 20 minutes' reporting time but presently only 10 minutes were given, so he would be as concise as possible in presenting a consolidated report on the crime figure for January to November 2019 as well as violent and illegal acts arising from the movement. He said that from January to November 2019, a total of 52 250 crimes were recorded, representing an increase of 2 128 crimes or 4.2% over the same period of 2018. In the first half of 2019, the overall crime figures dropped by 4.7% when compared with the same period of 2018. The figure was the lowest in 42 years. However, the trend reversed in the second half of 2019, with a series of violent illegal acts stemming from the movement since July. CoP remarked that the increase was especially significant for crimes directly related to violent acts arising from the movement. Compared with the same period of 2018, criminal damage increased by 2 153 cases, which mainly included vandalising shops and damaging MTR stations by rioters, etc.; arson increased by 535 cases or two-fold; offences against public order (offences such as riots and "Unlawful Assembly") increased by 865 cases or 39-fold. In the first 11 months of 2019, the overall crime figure in the Central and Western District saw a slight drop to 3 090 cases, compared with 3 127 cases in the same period of 2018. Apart from a slight drop of 2 cases of robbery, the rates of change of other crimes were broadly in line with the overall crime trend in Hong Kong. CoP said that a series of riots and other serious violent illegal acts took place in Hong Kong since last June, causing a negative impact on public order. Acts

of violent protesters included removal of roadside railings, vandalism of community facilities, arson at roadblocks, and blockage of public transport and roads, such as Tolo Highway, Lung Cheung Road, Nathan Road, etc. In addition, many paving blocks from footpaths had been ripped up by rioters and used as weapons to attack citizens, shops and police officers. An elderly man was hit to death by a paving block on 13 November. From June to December 2019, over 52 800 metres of roadside railing were removed, which was approximately the distance between Shek O and Chek Lap Kok Airport; nearly 21 800 square metres of paving blocks were ripped up, which was three times the size of the Hong Kong Stadium turf pitch. The Police came to notice that rioters began to use petrol bombs since last August. It was currently estimated that at least 5 000 petrol bombs had been used by rioters. Nearly 10 000 petrol bombs were seized by the Police during the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) incident, the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) incident, and at various locations of the territory. Assuming it took 10 seconds to hurl a petrol bomb, the time needed for hurling all the petrol bombs would be more than 27 hours. Also, protesters had gone from blocking roads to vandalising public transport facilities, including damaging traffic lights, vandalising 85 of the 94 heavy rail stations and 62 of the 68 light rail stations. Also, petrol bombs were hurled, fires set and objects thrown onto railway tracks and at trains in motion by protesters. These acts posed threat to public safety and might lead to massive casualties. Rioters also damaged targeted shops with different political stance and attacked persons with opposing political views. They had also repeatedly inflicted damages and set fires on the Court of Final Appeal and the High Court, which had severely undermined the authority of the courts and the city's spirit of the rule of law. The two ironic bronze lion statues outside the HSBC head office in Central had red paint sprayed on them and were set on fire during this year's January 1 public procession. He said that the bronze statues, which were used to be a symbol of pride for Hong Kong people, were now covered up with whiteboards. He asked if Hong Kong people really wanted Hong Kong to be turned to such a state. Other incidents of wanton attack by rioters included: on 1 August, a mainland reporter was tied on a trolley and illegally held and beaten up by rioters at the airport; in October, a taxi driver was beaten up by rioters and covered in blood; on 11 November, some rioters, due to different stances, poured flammable liquid onto a middle-aged man and set him on fire in Ma On Shan; on 13 November, a 70-year-old cleaner was hit in his head by a brick hurled by rioters and subsequently died; and on 1 December, a man who voluntarily cleared roadblocks was hit in his head by rioters with gully grating and was once unconscious. He said that so far more than 558 police officers had been injured. Serious incidents included neck injury caused by stabbing; leg injury caused by an arrow; severe burns caused by petrol bomb hurled by rioters; severe skin burns caused by corrosive liquid splashed by rioters and the police officer concerned had to undergo several skin grafting; and part of a finger bitten off by a protester while performing duties. The Police had recently discovered several cases involving the use of explosives and

genuine firearms, including a case on 20 December in which the suspect fired at a police officer and the Police subsequently seized an AR15 long-range rifle and a large quantity of bullets; and a case on 14 January in which the Police found in a flat bombs made of metal pipes which were extremely lethal. The Police also smashed an explosives laboratory in Sheung Shui.

32. For enforcement figures, CoP said that 7 019 people were arrested in connection with the disturbances arising from the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments and prosecution had been instituted against 1 092 of them. Among them, 547 people were charged with rioting, out of which 38 were convicted. 12 out of the 38 convicted persons were given jail sentence for possession of petrol bombs, and the maximum imprisonment term handed down was 14 months; two 15-year olds were sentenced to Rehabilitation Centre for damaging facilities in Light Rail stops and ordered to pay \$280,000 for the repair fees to the MTRCL. On the arrest of students, of the 7 019 persons arrested, 2 847 persons or around 40% claimed to be students. There was an upward trend in the number of students arrested since the start of the current school term in September 2019. The proportion had risen to 43% in September, compared with 25% between June and August before the start of the school term. What was even more worrying was that the proportion of secondary school students had risen from 7% before the start of the school term to 18% now, and the proportion of post-secondary students had increased from 18% to 25%. During the PolyU incident that occurred in November 2019, the Police arrested a total of 1 382 persons, only some 80 of them were PolyU students. As post-secondary students accounted for about 40% of the arrested persons, that meant 60% of those arrested were persons other than post-secondary students. In the past seven months in which the movement took place, the Police found that rioters ganged up and beat up citizens who took pictures and had different stances. Protesters also launched a "non-cooperative movement", which began with causing disturbances to shops and harassing customers therein, followed by wantonly vandalising shops holding different political views. Some protesters not only called on people to boycott shops with different stances, but even openly resorted to intimidation on the Internet to coerce others to do so. This was in essence triad-like tactic aiming at silencing people. During the movement, the Police found that some media had kept publishing fake news, false information, fake videos online to provoke hatred and grudges towards the Police. Some people even used spoofed photos to deliberately discredit the police force. Some netizens even doxxed and attacked police officers' families. CoP pointed out that an example of these fake news and false information was the rumour that the Police had beaten people to death at MTR Prince Edward Station on 31 August. Some media had subsequently found persons rumoured to have been "killed" in the incident, evidencing that the allegation was unfounded. The Police appealed to the public to stop spreading the rumour, and that it was willing to accept fact-based criticism but did not accept

malicious comments that slandered the police force. CoP said that the Police attached great importance to relationship with the community and citizens, and cherished District Council as a platform. He believed that District Council, as an important bridge between the public and the Government, was at the forefront of the community and closely related to people's daily lives; and District Council members were representatives of the local community. CoP agreed with Mr KAM's earlier condemnation of violence and concurred that any form of violence should be condemned. He also called on District Council members to lead by example and set an example of abiding by the law. They should not condone with or shelter offenders, and should come forward and condemn violence just like what Mr KAM did. In addition, he hoped that Members would verify the facts and verify with the Police when receiving information. They should also make clarification on false and hate provoking messages, and come forward against violent and illegal acts. He believed that this could help the community get back on track.

33. Some observers clapped hands in applause for CoP's speech. The Chairman reiterated the solemnity of the meeting, and said there was no need to clap hands. She asked the persons who clapped hands to leave, and asked all present to keep quiet.

34. The Vice-chairman requested DO(C&W) to perform her duties in assisting in ensuring the smooth conduct of Council meetings. He also asked whether DO(C&W) would tolerate acts of disregard for discipline and disrupting the proceedings in the Council by observers.

35. The Chairman remarked that Mr LO Wai-chung, former CoP, visited C&WDC on 7 March 2019, while Mr TANG Ping-keung, CoP, attended today's meeting to answer Members' questions. She said that all 15 Members present would speak and hoped that CoP could reply immediately.

36. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked the Chairman to request DO(C&W) to enforce the Standing Orders and evict the persons yelling in the public gallery, including former C&WDC Member Mr MAN Chi-wah, from the conference room.

37. The Vice-chairman agreed that the dignity of the Council should be upheld. He suggested that if DO(C&W) refused to perform her duties, the Council should write to HAD to reprimand her.

38. The Chairman asked DO(C&W) to remove the persons yelling in the public gallery and causing disturbance to the conduct of the meeting, including Mr MAN Chi-wah, some members of Area Committees and other observers, from the conference room.

39. With the permission of the Chairman, Mrs WONG HO Wing-sze, DO(C&W), addressed the meeting. She said the Standing Orders stipulated that the Chairman presided at meetings, and the Secretariat enforced the Standing Orders according to the ruling of the Chairman. As such, the persons who, in the view of the Chairman, had caused disruption to the conduct of the meeting could be asked to leave only upon the Chairman's request. She said that according to the rules mentioned by the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting, any person who caused disturbance to the conduct of the meeting would be given warnings by the Chairman. After two warnings, the Chairman could ask that person to leave the conference room. She asked the Chairman to make a ruling on the matter.

40. The Chairman said that two warnings had been given earlier, and she considered her reminder to the observers that there was no need to clap hands as the third one. She said that the persons concerned would be removed from the conference room if they caused disturbance to the conduct of the meeting again. The Chairman then invited Members to speak.

41. Mr YOUNG Chit-on thanked CoP for attending the meeting and communicating with Members in this turbulent time. He said that as a District Councillor and father of four, he was deeply afraid of what had happened in recent months. The Police played a pivotal role as the situation evolved. Residents had high hopes on CoP and they did not want protests to turn into riots. He also said that the pictures circulating on the Internet had caused a lot of worries among people with opposite stances, reckoning that the security of Hong Kong was gradually breaking down. Despite repeated calls by the Chief Executive for "stopping violence and curbing disorder", he could not see any results so far. He also had reasonable doubts as to whether the Police had strictly complied with relevant codes during their operations, and asked CoP how the public's lost confidence in the Police could be restored. He said that the social rifts was in part a result of police conduct. He earnestly requested CoP to explain his position and set about eliminating the confrontational sentiments between the Police and the public, in order to restore public trust in the Force.

42. CoP reiterated that he was against any form of violence, be it street violence, parliamentary violence or public official violence. As for restoring public confidence, CoP said that nowadays many people enticed others to break the law, impeded the effectiveness of police enforcement operations, and used fake news and spread false information to smear the Force. First, the Police hoped to show the truth to the public by clarifying the false information. Besides, he believed that the Force needed to be more transparent in order to enhance public understanding of police operations. Lastly, he said that the Police needed to enhance communication with people from all walks of life. The



Police had earlier tried to communicate with stakeholders such as universities, but the communication was forced to stop as there were malicious attacks on the universities' representatives. CoP opined that all parties in the society should remain open-minded, put aside prejudices, and communicate in good faith.

43. The Vice-chairman asked the Chairman if he could play a soundless documentary video as background information. The Chairman consented to the request. Mr KAM Nai-wai objected to the playing of the video at the time he spoke as he had not watched the video before. He said that communication with Members should be made before making such arrangement.

44. Mr YIP Kam-lung first would like to thank Mr "PK" for attending the Council's meeting. He also thanked Mr "PK" for arriving at the venue at 2:39 pm. He said that normally it was very difficult to contact the Police. He expressed discontent with the disappearance of the Police for 39 minutes and their failure to arrive at the scene to take enforcement actions in the Yuen Long incident during the movement. He also said that there were times when District Councillors needed police assistance, such as when handling incidents of "blue-ribbon" (Mr YIP interpreted it as a term used by Hong Kong people to describe Hong Kong's pro-communist camp and its supporters) mobs attacking citizens. But now when handling similar incidents, District Councillors had reservation about seeking police assistance because the said incident showed that the Police had not strictly enforced the law against offenders. Mr YIP first asked whether all actions taken by staff members of the Police were authorised by CoP and whether CoP should be held accountable for the conduct of frontline police officers.

45. CoP responded that as Commissioner, he had the ultimate responsibility for police operations.

46. Mr YIP Kam-lung raised question on matters concerning Letter of No Objection. He said that a public assembly organised by Civil Human Rights Front, for which the Police had issued the Letter of No Objection, was held on 12 June 2019 outside CITIC Tower. However, the Police, without notifying the applicant of the Letter of No Objection, fired tear gas at participants of the peaceful assembly, which almost resulted in a stampede off CITIC Tower. He asked whether CoP would assume full responsibility for this incident.

47. CoP said that he did not agree with the allegation made by Mr YIP that the Police had unreasonably fired tear gas at peaceful protesters. He pointed out that tear gas was fired because some people attacked police officers by hurling bricks at them at 3:00 pm on 12 June.

48. Mr YIP Kam-lung queried immediately after CoP's speech, demanding a square response from CoP as to whether the Letter of No Objection was still valid at that moment and why the Police had not notified the applicant of the lapse of the Letter of No Objection. CoP expressed regret for the interruption by Mr YIP. The Chairman asked CoP to continue to respond. CoP said that the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) was investigating the matter and the Police could not disclose too much about the case. But he clarified that the chaotic situation on that day was due to the organiser's appeal to the crowd to enter the venue from the footbridge leading to CITIC Tower.

49. Mr YIP Kam-lung again queried immediately after CoP's speech, demanding a square response from CoP as to whether the Letter of No Objection had lapsed then. He also asked CoP about the use of torch by civilians being determined by the Police as assault on police officers. He opined that if this was considered reasonable, the Police should stop shining strong light at reporters and civilians. The Chairman asked CoP to continue to respond. CoP said that IPCC was investigating the matter and they should leave it to IPCC for announcing the investigation results, and thus should not go into details of the incident at the meeting.

50. Mr YIP Kam-lung said that the incident took place in the Central and Western District and CoP had the responsibility to report to the C&WDC. CoP said he had answered the question and reiterated that the Police would not respond further in order to avoid adversely affecting the investigation results. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked the Chairman to put on record that CoP refused to answer whether or not the Letter of No Objection existed in name only. CoP responded that the system of Letter of No Objection was sound, and the Police would not respond further on individual incidents.

51. Mr YIP Kam-lung continued to raise questions on the public procession organised by Civil Human Rights Front on 8 December 2019. He said that police commander set up a defence line at Pedder Street without notifying Mr CHAN Ho-wun, holder of the Letter of No Objection. Mr YIP said that at the time he and other citizens held the Letter of No Objection and asked the commander to notify Mr CHAN Ho-wun, but police officers shined strong light at them. He questioned CoP if such act of the Police constituted assault against Mr CHAN Ho-wun, citizens and reporters. CoP responded that being issued a Letter of No Objection did not imply that the Police would tolerate any illegal act at the assembly.

52. Mr YIP Kam-lung questioned whether it was an offence for police officers to shine strong light at civilians. CoP said that the Council should conduct rational discussions and expressed regret at Mr YIP's hostile attitude. The Chairman asked CoP

to respond to whether it was an offence for police officers to shine strong light at civilians. CoP replied that it could not be generalised and should depend on the situation, such as whether there was a need to subdue suspects; so it was hard to tell whether it was right or wrong.

53. Miss YAM Ka-yi believed that CoP visited the Council in order to mend Police's relationship with civilians, but she was surprised by the written reply from the HKPF. She indicated that she had written to HKPF earlier to enquire about the number of complaints received by the Police, but the reply from HKPF used millions of words to evade the question and even asked DC members to support Police's law enforcement, just like teaching DC members how things should be done. Miss YAM considered that the Police's reply had failed to respond to Members' questions. She said that DC members were elected by the public, it was their duty to put questions to heads of government departments and they needed not be taught how things should be done. She asked CoP whether the reply had been submitted to him for perusal.

54. CoP responded that the reply had been seen by him beforehand and the Police had answered the questions raised by Members. As for the content cited by Miss YAM regarding the emphasis on the importance of cooperation between the Police and DCs, the Police had expectations on the work of elected DCs, hoping that DCs would play a leading role and maintain cooperation with the Police.

55. Miss YAM Ka-yi said that pursuant to section 4 of the Police Force Ordinance (Cap 232), the Commissioner, subject to the orders and control of the Chief Executive, should be charged with the supreme direction and administration of the police force. She expressed disappointment on the CoP for failing to properly manage his subordinates' work, leading to the issuance of such an inappropriate reply. Miss YAM continued that she tried to assist the arrested people outside the police cordon lines during the January 1 public procession, but some police officers pointed their guns at her. Miss YAM questioned CoP whether it was legal for police officers to point their guns at civilians. CoP responded that as he was not certain about the situation at the time, he could not judge whether the police officer's behaviour was legal. He suggested Miss YAM to lodge a complaint with the Complaints Against Police Office (CAPO), saying that CAPO would handle the matter seriously.

56. Miss YAM Ka-yi asked whether CoP rendered himself not responsible for managing his subordinates. She remarked that on the day of the January 1 public procession, police officers, after pointing guns at her, shined strong light at her eyes. Miss YAM had at the time told the police officers that she was a DC member and that she felt uncomfortable with light shining at her eyes. She also told the police officers that

she wanted to assist the arrested, but her words went unheard and the police officers even said that this was the usual practice. Miss YAM questioned CoP whether police officer shining strong light at people's eyes constituted an assault. CoP responded that he welcomed Miss YAM to lodge a complaint with the Police with the support of evidence and testimonies.

57. Miss YAM Ka-yi interrupted CoP's speech and questioned CoP whether he needed to take responsibility for police officers' actions, rather than just telling people to complain. CoP said that the frequent interruptions to his speech had made it difficult for the Council's meeting to serve as a platform for communication. He believed that the public had certain expectations on DCs and they hoped that DCs could serve as a platform for communication, not one for street quarrels. He asked the Chairman to allow him to continue to respond, and reiterated that it was not possible to determine whether it was against the law for police officers to shine strong light at civilians based on the one-sided story from Members, as it depended on the overall situation at the scene.

58. Miss YAM Ka-yi further pointed out that some police officer called her "cockroach" at the time. She asked CoP whether it was appropriate for police officers to call citizens "cockroach". CoP reckoned that any words with negative connotation should not appear. Miss YAM interrupted CoP's speech and asked if he would order police officers to stop calling citizens "cockroach". CoP reiterated that Miss YAM could lodge a complaint with the Police if she considered the matter inappropriate, but he agreed that police officers should be careful with their tongue.

59. Miss YAM Ka-yi asked CoP whether it was lawful for arrested persons to shout out loud their name and whether police officers had no right to stop it. She said that because during the July 1 public procession some police officer indicated that the names of citizens was privacy and so the arrested persons could not disclose their names. CoP said that it depended on circumstances and could not be generalised, and it could not be ruled out that by shouting out loud his name an arrested person was conveying some secret signal.

60. Miss YAM Ka-yi asked CoP whether citizens could, without obstructing police officers in their work, make video records during identity card checks. CoP agreed that citizens could make video records on the premise that this would not cause obstruction to police officers in their work or violate the law.

61. The Chairman added that CoP gave a clear reply on whether police officers should call citizens "cockroach" and she urged CoP to order police officers to stop calling citizens "cockroach". The Chairman also asked the rowdy person in red to leave the

conference room.

62. Mr WONG Weng-chi said that he had collected public views on the police force. He showed CoP a piece of raw pork meat (meaning "fabrication of evidence"), and said that many residents living in the neighbourhood were very afraid of malicious prosecution by the Police. He asked CoP if he knew what was shameful. He said that in the 1960s and 70s, in view of police corruption, the Independent Commission Against Corruption was set up to tackle the problem. Now that police violence went on for half a year, why there was still no effective institution to monitor the police force. He said that now IPCC existed in name only and no institution could effectively monitor the police force. He believed that this was obvious to the people of Hong Kong. Mr WONG requested that close-circuit television (CCTV) cameras be installed inside police stations to prevent citizens from being beaten up by police officers inside police stations and covered in blood, so as to protect the safety of the arrested persons. He asked CoP if this was feasible.

63. CoP expressed regret at the unsubstantiated allegation made by Mr WONG. He considered this unacceptable, and said the Chairman had also said at the start of the meeting that no insulting speech should be made. Mr WONG Weng-chi interrupted CoP's speech, saying that residents living in the neighbourhood asked him to return this piece of raw pork meat to CoP because police officers were "fabricating evidence against citizens" every day, be it in police stations or openly in the face of the public. CoP expressed regret for being silenced when he wanted to speak.

64. Mr WONG Weng-chi further asked CoP whether it was feasible to install CCTV cameras inside police stations. He said some citizens said to him in tears that they worried that their children would be beaten up inside police stations and covered in blood, or even beaten to death with their dead body gone without a trace. Hence, he requested CoP to give a direct answer as to whether installation of CCTV cameras was feasible. CoP expressed regret at the unfounded allegation made and the release of false information by Mr WONG, and asked the Chairman to make a ruling on such unfounded allegation. Mr WONG Weng-chi again interrupted CoP's speech, requesting CoP to respond on the installation of CCTV cameras.

65. The Chairman believed that Mr WONG was only relaying citizens' views to the police force and ruled that there was nothing wrong with that. He asked CoP to respond on the installation of CCTV cameras. (Some observers shouted in the public gallery. The Chairman advised the trouble-makers to leave.)

66. CoP expressed helplessness over the Chairman's ruling. He responded that

installation of CCTV cameras could be considered where feasible, such as in prisoners' cells. He went on to say that due to the occurrence of suicide before, the Police had implemented a pilot scheme to install CCTV cameras. However, in consideration of protecting the privacy of witnesses, he had reservation about installing CCTV cameras all over a police station. Consideration might be given to installing CCTV cameras at suitable places.

67. The Chairman asked whether prisoners' cells referred to the cells where detainees were held for 48 hours. CoP responded that prisoners' cells were the detention cells of police station.

68. Mr WONG Weng-chi said that there was public concern that the Police would inflict harm on citizens at places not under CCTV surveillance in police station. He requested CoP to make improvement in this regard shortly to ease the public's mind. CoP responded that installing CCTV cameras at places like search rooms was inappropriate, and in consideration of the privacy of witnesses and prisoners, it would be difficult to install CCTV cameras all over a police station. CoP said that the police force was willing to increase transparency under practicable circumstances, and CCTV cameras had been installed in detention cells that aroused controversy.

69. Mr WONG Weng-chi asked the Chairman to put on record the installation of CCTV cameras in police stations and police vehicles as a matter that required continuous follow-up. Mr WONG also hoped that CoP would accept the piece of "raw pork meat" and never again fabricate evidence against citizens. He reiterated that his criticism on the police force was not an insult, saying that more than half of Hong Kong people gave the police force a zero score did not mean that half of the citizens were insulting the force. Rather, the police force should reflect on this and stop suppressing students and young people. He quoted Mr MAO Zedong's words that "Those who suppress students will have a bitter end", and hoped that the Police would never again suppress young students. CoP again expressed regret at Mr WONG's unfounded allegation (i.e. the Police "fabricated evidence against citizens"), and asked Member to provide exact details such as the time, place and subject of relevant cases to support the allegation. Mr WONG said that reporters had made similar allegations against the Police at the daily Police press conference during the past six months.

70. Mr YOUNG Chit-on raised a point of order. He considered it inappropriate for some Members to argue with CoP when the latter was speaking. The Chairman reiterated that the session on "Meeting the Commissioner of Police" at today's meeting was conducted in a question-and-answer format. She reminded Members to respect the opportunity for CoP to speak and should not interrupt without permission.

71. Ms WONG Kin-ching said many people hoped that CoP would explain the problem of police brutality since the start of the movement. She indicated that members of the public still wished to communicate with the Police. However, in its written reply to Members' questions, the Police expressed strong discontent with Members' questions and considered this unacceptable. Such a reply indicated that the Police would not consider making apology in any form and had closed the door to communication. She also pointed out that the Q&A with CoP at the meeting earlier also indicated that CoP did not intend to maintain good communication with Members and the public. She said that if the pre-condition for communication was for Members to acknowledge that police brutality did not exist, the claim that police brutality did not exist was, in her view, factually incorrect, and was also unacceptable to Members. Also, she said that she had no idea whether CoP's visit was to persuade the public and Members that police brutality did not exist or for other purposes, but she believed that such purposes would not be met because they would not be accepted by the public and Members. She said that footage of excessive use of force against civilians by the Police, the largest government law-enforcement agency, had been repeatedly captured by the media. Their blatantly unlawful acts were also supported by CoP and the Chief Executive, who were against the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry. This was exactly "ruled by the voice of one man alone". Hong Kong had turned from a civilised society to a place even more backward than a third-world city. The Police also deployed police officers to scare students, causing wasteful employment of Police. She said that police officers were deployed to the vicinity of schools on the first day of the school term in September 2019 to search the schoolbags of students in school uniforms. When students asked the police officers why they had to search their schoolbags, the police officers put a counter-question to the students ferociously as to whether they were assaulting the Police. Ms WONG pointed out that while police manpower was wasted on things like these, the Police told the public that they had insufficient manpower to conduct normal patrols and combat illegal parking. She reckoned that this was causing social chaos and the Police had an undeniable responsibility for this. She also said that according to the information provided by the Police, the Police had arrested more than 7 000 people in public events related to the movement since last June. But only some 1 000 people were prosecuted. These figures had evidenced the Police's indiscriminate arrest. Although the "721" and "831" incidents took place outside the Central and Western District and she would not pursue these incidents in detail, Hong Kong people learned those cases of "being suicided" and "being disappeared" from media reports. The Police could not muddle through by claiming that these were cases with no suspicious circumstances surrounding the cause of death. She said that people of all 18 districts would pursue responsibility from the Police. Remarking that CoP referred the protesters as rioters, she asked whether the real rioters were those police officers who did not display warrant cards whilst on duty. She asked

CoP if he could identify the appearance of all police officers on duty, and how could the identity of individual police officers be known if they did not display their warrant cards.

72. CoP responded that as mentioned by Ms WONG, one should not admit anything that was not true. Hence, he could not admit the existence of police brutality, which was not true. He expressed regret at the allegation made by Ms WONG that the police force had killed people and made people "disappeared", remarking that the Police had repeatedly clarified that the rumors about the "831" incident were not true. As a DC member, she should provide evidence in support of what she believed as true, otherwise it would be difficult to prove its authenticity. It would be regrettable if someone disseminated these unsubstantiated messages in the capacity of DC member. CoP also considered that police officers should wear uniform, warrant card or operational call sign whilst on duty. Plainclothes police officers should produce warrant cards for public identification under practicable circumstances. However, sometimes police officers might need to handle other tasks first in light of the circumstances at the scene and thus might not be able to produce warrant cards at once. Regarding the arrest of more than 7 000 people and prosecution of some 1 000 people, he said that the Police had been following up on the remaining arrested persons, but investigation took time. Also, prosecution had been instituted against some other arrested persons in phases recently. The Police would follow up the matter closely.

73. Ms WONG Kin-ching asked whether police officers not displaying warrant cards had violated police internal guidelines or the law. CoP said that police officers needed to produce warrant cards where reasonably practicable. Refusal to produce warrant cards without justifiable reason might constitute a disciplinary offence.

74. Ms WONG Kin-ching enquired with CoP that how members of the public should react if someone conducted body searches on them without producing warrant cards. CoP reiterated that police officers should produce warrant cards under practicable circumstances in exercising police powers and when there were needs for community interaction. However, under special circumstances, for example, when a police officer was in the course of subduing a criminal, it was reasonable if he failed to produce his warrant card to bystanders, although the police officer should produce his warrant card when the threat was no longer present.

75. Ms WONG Kin-ching interrupted CoP's speech. She told CoP that some reporters captured footage of a police officer refusing to produce warrant card under a non-chaotic situation and telling members of the public with a fierce attitude that he was a police officer. Ms WONG further asked whether members of the public could use the footage captured as evidence to lodge a complaint, and whether the Police would follow



up. CoP responded that members of the public could lodge a complaint with the Police as long as they could provide specific information on the time, date, and location and there were witnesses or evidence. The Police would definitely handle the complaint in a fair and impartial manner.

76. Ms WONG Kin-ching said that CAPO was under HKPF, and IPCC had no real power. Ms WONG said that Members and the public would not give up pursuing responsibility, and requested the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry.

77. The Chairman reminded that each Member had up to four minutes to raise questions, which included the time for CoP to reply to the Member's questions.

78. Mr PANG Ka-ho reckoned that criticisms raised at the meeting sounded rational and discussions were based on facts. He did not want to vent his emotions. He said there was no hatred without reason or cause, and he did not want to mention again examples of how the Police had violated police codes. He said that the community would not oppose the existence of the police force, so he believed that what required to be discussed was not whether the police force needed to enforce the law, but was how police actions should be measured against the yardstick for law enforcement and how an effective check and balance mechanism could be established to handle cases of violation of relevant regulations. Mr PANG said that some illegal protesters were already sentenced by court, but thoughts should be given to whether police officers who were in breach of the rules and regulations should also be sanctioned by the law. He said that police officers, as law enforcement officers, should enforce the law and uphold the rule of law in accordance with the ordinance. They should abide by the law even in the face of protesters' violent acts and verbal abuse. There was no excuse for police officers to break the law and the Police must not rationalise police officers' misconduct. Mr PANG pointed out that police officers were taught to "without favour to any person and with malice or ill-will toward none" in the Police College, they should therefore comply with the code of conduct. He reiterated that the meeting was not to discuss whether police officers should enforce the law at the scene, but it was indeed necessary to review the yardstick for their law enforcement actions. When members of the public kept calling for disband of the police force, he considered it a shame on the Police as a disciplinary force. He appealed to the Police to reflect on why members of the public would have such a demand, which did not happen overnight. He remarked that having the power to enforce the law did not mean that abuse in the procedure of law enforcement would be tolerated. He said that the police force had repeatedly violated the Police Force Ordinance, Public Order Ordinance, Criminal Procedure Ordinance, Police (Discipline) Regulations, Police General Orders, etc. in the past few months. Many citizens and reporters had previously complained about this. He hoped that the Police would reflect on whether what they had

done in the past were consistent with the oath they took at the Police College. It was fine if they believed that they were competent, otherwise they needed to reflect on the matter.

79. CoP agreed with Mr PANG that anyone who broke the law, including police officers, should be sanctioned, and the Police also had to comply with regulations. (As time was up, the Chairman said that CoP could not continue with his speech. CoP expressed regret at not being able to respond. DO(C&W) suggested that a reminder be given to Members when they had spoken for three minutes, so as to allow time for CoP to respond. The Chairman appealed to Members to allow two minutes for CoP to respond.)

80. Mr NG Siu-hong asked whether CoP knew why so many people, so many citizens, students, community dignitaries, priests and pastors were discontented with the Police. He pointed out that it was due to their perception of the uneven-handed treatment. Mr NG and the people saw the unfairness in the "721" and "831" incidents; saw the unfairness in police officers maiming young people; saw the unfairness in people from his alma mater being held up in restaurant at Mid-levels by anti-riot police officers; and saw the unfairness in anti-riot police officers imposed lockdown on the Central-Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System where no protesters but only the "elderly and young ones" were present, resulting in residents of Mid-levels being forced to stay up there and affected by tear gas. His parents, who were over 60 years old, participated in a lawful demonstration together with many Mid-levels District residents. When passing Central while returning to the Mid-levels after the demonstration, they encountered anti-riot police officers who suddenly jumped down from cars, pointed the rifles, batons and tear gas launchers at them and used foul language to address them. They considered this unfair. He pointed out that Police's behaviour towards civilians would only aggravate the confrontational situation and make more people hated the Police. The public had said no to police brutality through the DC Election. Both Mr NG and the public supported establishing an independent commission of inquiry and they believed that only by doing so could the tense situation be eased. Mr NG said he often went to the frontline to monitor police enforcement actions when the Police turned up in the district. He wore shirt and trousers with his DC member card properly displayed, but police officers had repeatedly shined strong light at him and abused him with foul language whenever he showed up in the frontline. He questioned CoP whether police officers were out of control or were instructed to discharge their duties by using foul language. Mr NG asked CoP to answer the question first.

81. CoP said that Mr NG Siu-hong could consider lodging a complaint to the Police, and comment on Police's behavior at the time could not be made based on a one-sided story. CoP originally wanted to cite an example to explain, but Mr NG said time was insufficient. Mr NG asked if CoP could respond on whether police officers were

instructed by him to abuse the public with foul language. The Chairman also indicated that CoP should first respond to the issue about police officers abusing the public with foul language, instead of talking about the New Town Plaza in Sha Tin. CoP agreed that police officers should not use any improper language.

82. Mr NG said it was obvious that police officers were out of control and disobeyed the instructions of their superiors. Mr NG queried why police officers who were out of control and disobeyed the instruction of CoP by using foul language were allowed to carry rifles and enforce the law. Even more, electric stun guns were bought for them. Mr NG questioned how police officers who were out of control could be allowed to carry guns. He asked whether CoP could instruct frontline police officers to stop using foul language and stop pointing their weapons at unarmed civilians, including Council Members and reporters. CoP reiterated that police officers should not use any improper language, but he disagreed with Mr NG's remark that police officers were out of control. He said that police officers had done their best in discharging their duties in the past seven months. Mr NG said he would give CoP time to speak later. CoP expressed helplessness over his being "silenced" again.

83. Mr NG Siu-hong said many police malpractices were observed when he went to the frontline to monitor police enforcement actions. He would contact the Police Community Relations Officers (PCROs) when witnessed such malpractices at the scene. However, PCROs were hard to locate. Even if a PCRO was found, the officer would reply that it was the decision of the frontline Commander. When he went to find the Commander, the Commander could not be located because he/she was surrounded by many police officers who abused the public with foul language. Moreover, when meetings were held, the Commanders refused to attend the meetings although formal invitation was extended by the DC. These made the citizens became more and more angry because the Commanders refused to visit the DC to explain matters. As CoP had come to the C&WDC, Mr NG asked whether CoP could instruct senior police officers and frontline Commanders to accept the invitation when the Chairman invited them to attend Council meetings to answer questions. CoP said that the Commanders would attend Council meetings to answer questions from Members. (Time was up, and CoP said that he was again "silenced" because of this. The Chairman said that this was not "silencing", she simply wanted to uphold the four-minute speaking time rule. The Chairman also asked the person at the public gallery who spoke loudly to leave the conference room.)

84. Ms NG Hoi-yan said that earlier she and Mr KAM Nai-wai submitted a discussion paper titled "Stop police violence and restore calm to Hong Kong", but HKPF replied that the paper title was misleading. She asked CoP which part of it was misleading. CoP responded that it was difficult to concur with the term "police

violence", and said that Police's actions were in response to the violent acts of protesters and police officers had responsibility to maintain law and order.

85. Ms NG Hoi-yan remarked that the news photos about police brutality placed in front of Members were evidence that police brutality did exist. She also said that the failure of the Police to provide factual evidence was the reason why the public did not believe Police's clarification on the "831" incident. She hoped that CoP would provide evidence to support his remarks. In addition, she quoted CoP's remark that violence of any form was improper, and said that violence was not only referred to physical violence but also parliamentary violence. She said that there was also institutional violence in Hong Kong nowadays, and asked CoP whether he was in favour of selection of the Chief Executive and election of the LegCo by universal suffrage. CoP reiterated that it was not possible to determine all the facts simply based on photos, it was also necessary to understand what happened before and after the shooting. He also gave an example that some people's interpretation of certain photos was inconsistent with the facts. As regards the "831" incident, he said that the Police had made repeated clarifications that no deaths resulted from police operations. However, it was difficult to prove something that did not happen, just like it was difficult to prove someone did not drink coke on a certain day, so it was difficult to collect evidence as proof. Regarding his view on universal suffrage, CoP said that he was only responsible for investigation of criminal cases and would not respond on political issues.

86. Ms NG Hoi-yan enquired with CoP about manpower distribution of the Police. She asked whether substantial manpower was deployed to handle public order events and so there was insufficient police officers patrolling the streets. She asked whether the Police were negligent and took the lead in disrupting the tranquility of the community. CoP disagreed that police officers were negligent. He pointed out that the Police had spent a lot of time and resources on handling the nuisance that rioters caused to society. He said that tremendous manpower was deployed to patrol which helped to crack down many cases.

87. Mr LEUNG Fong-wai said that he chose to cover his face at the meeting, because in addition to being a DC member, he was also a Hongkonger, a so-called rioter in the eyes of CoP and his colleagues. He said CoP might not understand why there were continuous public processions and demonstrations in the past seven months. He pointed out that the reasons might be the ineffective governance by the Chief Executive and the SAR Government, or failure of the current social system to absorb the voices of young people. But a more important reason, which had also triggered a series of conflicts, must be police brutality. He said that the Police's handling of the "612" incident was improper. The siege of CITIC Tower on that day was already improper, and he did not

understand why tear gas was fired at the peaceful protesters. Some civilians who distributed water at Edinburgh Place on that day were beaten by anti-riot police officers; foreigners with impaired mobility were dispersed with pepper spray whilst leaving; some reporter was verbally assaulted by police officer with foul language during reporting. Mr LEUNG asked CoP why so far no police officer was interdicted from duty or given disciplinary punishment for the law enforcement actions in the "612" incident even with all necessary news clips and sufficient evidence in place. He said that since the eruption of the disturbances arising from the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, some civil servants and teachers had been interdicted from duty for participating in the movement. He questioned why the police force needed not be interdicted from duty and subject to internal investigation.

88. CoP responded that masked persons were not necessarily rioters; only those who had committed violent acts should be called rioters. He believed that Mr LEUNG Fong-wai was just wearing a mask and was not a rioter. He continued that IPCC was carrying out an investigation on the "612" incident and it was not appropriate to discuss the specific details. CoP said that police officers, like other civil service teams, would be interdicted from duty or given disciplinary punishment for violation of rules if there was evidence, they also need to face suspension and disciplinary actions for violations. But so far no such cases were found. (As some reporters were shooting footages near where CoP sat, CoP was concerned about the disclosure of confidential documents. He asked the Chairman to remind the media to pay attention. The Chairman said she believed in the professional conduct of reporters and that they would not shoot the contents of confidential documents.)

89. Mr LEUNG Fong-wai said that as the saying went, there was distinction between human and animals. The biggest difference was that human would introspect. If there was only one person accused the Police of brutality, this might be out of prejudice. But now with hundreds of thousands, or even two million citizens saying that there was police brutality, CoP should do self-reflection and ponder whether what the police force did over the past seven months were really above board. Mr LEUNG continued that in the past six months, he did not see even the slightest self-reflection by the Police. Instead, at the press conference held daily at 4:00 pm, the Police continued to cover up lies with lies and distort facts, such as calling a person "yellow object", commenting that a police officer was using his feet to "push away" a person at the scene, etc. He considered these remarks ridiculous. Therefore, he believed that as the entire police force, from CoP to frontline police officers alike, lacked the ability to reflect, it showed that there were major problems in the entire police system from training, performance of duties to complaints mechanism. In light of this, he believed that right now only by disbanding and reforming the police force could Hong Kong have a way out. He said he

did not require a response from CoP to his comments.

90. Mr KAM Nai-wai expressed deep disappointment with CoP's speech just now. He said that at the time of the "612" incident, Police beat citizens up fiercely and fired tear gas abusively in Admiralty without regard to the safety of people at the scene. At the time of the "721" incident, indigenous villagers and triads in Yuen Long attacked citizens brutally, and police officers, instead of enforcing the law, turned away and left the scene. (Some people were yelling in the public gallery, the Chairman asked the yelling people, and those who were clapping hands, to leave) At the time of the "811" incident, Police fired "execution style" at civilians at close range in front of escalators at MTR Tai Koo Station. At the time of the "831" incident, Police indiscriminately attacked passengers inside train compartments at MTR Prince Edward Station. At the time of the "1111" incident, Police fired a live round at an unarmed student in Sai Wan Ho. On 1 January, Police conducted a large scale arrest operation in Causeway Bay on the basis of "arrest first and see whether prosecution could be instituted later". All these were facts. He pointed out that the Police said every day at the 4 pm Police press conference that if there was no law-breaking behaviour, the Police would not resort to the use of violence; and CoP also said just now that he could not draw conclusions based on just one shot. Mr KAM said these were all nonsense. He trusted that the public all had discerning eyes. Police officers kept insulting people with vulgar language, kept shining strong light at citizens, reporters and LegCo/DC members; a young student was beaten up by police officers on the street and covered in blood for asking the police officers, "Where has your conscience gone?" All these were substantive evidences. Mr KAM continued that Police purposely charged against civilians in shopping malls, and Police spokesperson said that the matter could be resolved simply by saying "please excuse us". Mr KAM continued that CoP was a scoundrel in claiming that Mr KAM also supported him in opposing violence, and now Mr KAM understood what "out of context" really meant. Mr KAM solemnly told CoP again that the forms of violence he was opposed to were "violence inherited in the parliamentary system, institutional violence, violence associated with DQ (disqualification of candidates at LegCo/DC elections), and police brutality). He hoped that CoP would not quote his words out of context, and said that CoP had antagonised the majority of people by saying that there was no police brutality. He stressed that the public all had discerning eyes, and that 40% of Hong Kong people gave the police force a zero score was to tell the Police that police brutality did exist. Mr KAM continued that TV footages showed that a police officer ploughed his motorcycle into the crowd; a reporter was shot in the eye by Police; police officers stepped on protesters' heads after subduing them; 10-odd anti-riot police officers besieged and beat a defenseless man lying on the ground. All these footages were factual evidence from a wide angle of view. Mr KAM opined that in the case of Superintendent CHU King-wai, the defendant was sentenced to imprisonment based on just one screen shot. Based on

this standard, he believed that hundreds of police officers would be sentenced to imprisonment for tens of years. Mr KAM said that if CoP continued to shirk responsibility and refused to acknowledge the problem of police brutality, he would like CoP to explain why police officers needed to use facial covering in law enforcement operations. He asked CoP if he knew whether someone with facial covering was a police officer or a robber, and what was so urgent that it made police officers reluctant to produce their warrant cards. He said CoP was in fact a scoundrel. On behalf of the public, he told CoP that police officers with such performance were not acceptable, and asked CoP to "get lost". Lastly, Mr KAM requested CoP to step down.

91. (The Chairman originally said that Mr KAM Nai-wai's speaking time was up. CoP said that it would be regrettable if he could not respond to Mr KAM's speech. So the Chairman allowed CoP to give a brief response. Meanwhile, some observers yelled at Members. The Chairman asked the yelling people to leave.) CoP first said that he would forgive Mr KAM for hurling personal insults at him, because it only showed Mr KAM lacked magnanimity. Regarding Mr KAM's speech, he pointed out that Mr KAM only condemned a series of institutional violence without mentioning street violence. He put a counter-question to Mr KAM as to whether Mr KAM concurred with street violence like that in the "1111" incident where a Ma On Shan resident was splashed with gasoline and set on fire, and in the "1113" incident where an elderly man died after being hit by a brick thrown by protesters in Sheung Shui. CoP said that he could not concur with these violence. CoP also could not concur with some of the words used by Mr KAM, including what Mr KAM said that Police fired "execution style" at citizens at the time of the "811" incident; for the "831" incident, Police's conduct was not "indiscriminate"; and at the time of the Sai Wan Ho incident, the police officer fired because someone attempted to snatch his gun, not as what Mr KAM claimed that "fired a live round at an unarmed student".

92. Mr HUI Chi-fung asked if the Police had done anything wrong or had any misconduct in the disturbances arising from the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments. CoP responded that he believed the Police had room for improvement in the disturbances (Mr HUI asked CoP to respond squarely and not to beat about the bush. Mr YOUNG Chit-on hoped that the Chairman could preside over the meeting, saying that it seemed like Mr HUI was presiding over the meeting and that he had also repeatedly interrupted CoP who was speaking). Areas that could be improved included police operation strategies, approach of communication with the media, police equipment, and attitude of police officers in contact with the public.

93. Mr HUI Chi-fung asked CoP whether improvement was needed only for those areas he mentioned just now and the police force had not committed any mistakes in other areas. In response, CoP said areas that required improvement were by no means

exhaustive.

94.           Remarking that more than 7 000 people were arrested and over 1 000 persons prosecuted in the disturbances arising from the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, Mr HUI Chi-fung enquired with CoP about why no police officer had been prosecuted so far. He was also concerned that not even one case among the numerous complaint cases against the Police could be established and no police officer had been given disciplinary punishment. He asked whether it was because the police force was flawless or whether it was being condoned and harboured. He said that placards with writings saying "Shame on the Police" held up by Members was an exact description of CoP. CoP responded that the Police would pursue public officials and police officers for their illegal acts. Mr HUI interrupted and asked why not even one case could be established. CoP said that there was insufficient evidence to pursue cases against any police officer. Mr HUI interrupted and asked why evidence could be gathered for the 1 000-odd cases against civilians, but not so for the cases against police officers. He asked if CoP, as the top person in charge of the police force, was condoning and harbouring the Police. CoP said he certainly would not agree with the allegation that the Force was condoning police officers.

95.           Mr HUI Chi-fung pointed out that the police force was rated as the least popular of the nine disciplinary forces, with 40% of the citizens gave the Force a zero score, hitting a record low. Mr HUI enquired about CoP's views on this. In response, CoP said he was aware of the negative public perception of the Force which seemed to be deteriorating. He considered it difficult to compare the police force with other disciplinary forces services because of the difference in job nature. He reckoned that the negative public perception of the police force was due to some people being misled by fake news and some others' belief that there was a need to fight for their demands through illegal means. It was therefore natural for the Police's law enforcement actions to cause dissatisfaction. He said there was certainly room for improvement for and enhanced transparency of the Police.

96.           Mr HUI Chi-fung asked whether reports that some citizens were shot blind by the Police, a police officer rammed his motorbike into a crowd of protesters at high speed, and people got beaten up by police officers and suffered head injuries were fake news. He also asked CoP whether he would apologise to the public for police brutality. CoP responded that regarding a female suspected of being shot blind in Tsim Sha Tsui, the Police wished to obtain the medical report of the injured for review in order to conduct an investigation to find out the truth, but was unable to do so because a judicial review was underway. Besides, he opined that the rioters, including those arrested by the Police, should apologise for the adverse impact on society.



97. Mr HUI Chi-fung said that CoP should be ashamed for his reluctance to apologise. CoP disagreed and considered what Mr HUI said just now an insult.

98. Mr HO Chi-wang remarked that CoP had repeatedly emphasised “rioters” and the arrest of rioters by the Police at the start of his speech. He expressed regret at the Police's remarks. He said that CoP had mentioned just now that 7 019 people had been arrested, with only 1 029 being prosecuted and only 38 convicted. He questioned why CoP said that the people being arrested were rioters, as only 38 people had been convicted. He said that Common Law was practised in Hong Kong and any person should be presumed innocent before duly convicted. He asked why CoP could keep condoning himself and his subordinates to repeatedly call those not yet convicted rioters. Besides, he said CoP had mentioned that police officers should not use vulgar language, and his subordinate, Mr KONG Wing-cheung, had also repeatedly mentioned at press conferences that it was undesirable for police officers to call members of the public “cockroach”. CoP had also said in his response just now that the Police had much room for improvement in deployment and execution. He said that it had been more than seven months since 12 June and asked why CoP could still allow undesirable things to continue to happen over such a long period. He asked CoP whether he was incapable of managing his subordinates and whether a more desirable approach could be adopted for police operations. He opined that CoP should assume accountability and step down if he was incapable of exercising proper management. He appealed to CoP to step down expeditiously. He also supported the disbandment and reform of the police force as he considered that the Force’s performance was very poor in recent years. He asked CoP to respond.

99. CoP responded that there was a large difference between the number of arrested persons and the number of convicted persons because many cases were still under investigation and had yet to proceed to trial. Mr HO Chi-wang questioned how the arrested persons could be called rioters if their cases had yet to proceed to trial. CoP said that rioters were not confined to those convicted in court, those who vandalised public properties and set fires in the streets could also be regarded as rioters even if they were not yet arrested. Mr HO said that evidence must be provided to substantiate the charge, and he questioned why CoP kept emphasising the word “rioter”. CoP hoped that the Chairman would maintain order at the meeting and advise Members to allow him the opportunity to answer questions. The Chairman said that the Member was just repeating the question that he wanted CoP to answer.

100. CoP responded that he did not know how to describe those who vandalised public properties and set fires except for calling them “rioters”. Mr HO Chi-wang said

that the words “protesters” and “citizens” could be used to describe them. CoP remarked that they were “protesters” if they did not use violence, otherwise they were “rioters”. Regarding the public's recognition of his abilities, CoP was aware that certain citizens did not agree with this, but some citizens did. He said that he was not politically appointed and therefore could not assume accountability and step down. During the time, Mr HO expressed that the public did not approve CoP's abilities and that more than half of Hong Kong people gave the police force a zero score. Mr HO asked if CoP would resign. CoP responded that he was open and aboveboard and performed his job well, and believed that only those who feared justice would want him to resign.

101. Mr HO Chi-wang said CoP had just mentioned that the Police had cracked down on a number of crimes during patrols in communities. He was not sure about the nature of those crimes, but pointed out that there was serious illegal parking in the district. He had contacted the Police Community Relations Office to relay the illegal parking problem in the streets of the district. But the Police responded that due to the lack of manpower, they could not spare manpower and time to deal with the problem. They even indicated that illegal parking was not an urgent matter and was thus not accorded priority for speedy handling. He hoped CoP would explain. CoP responded that the Police had set priorities in handling cases, and they had to deal with cases including robberies and vandalism of banks first. During the time, Mr HO asked if illegal parking was not a matter of urgency, and asked how many robbery cases and illegal parking cases occurred in the Central and Western District. The Chairman said that there was a serious problem of illegal parking in the district which prevented buses from making turns on roads. She then said that Mr HO's speaking time was up.

102. Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin displayed three photos and asked CoP whether he could identify who was a police officer in the photos. CoP responded that he might not be able to tell immediately who was a police officer. Miss CHEUNG queried why he did not know who was a police officer. CoP responded that he learned afterwards that the person in one of the photos was a police officer; as for the persons in the other two photos, he could not tell whether they were police officers. He said that police officers would display warrant cards under practicable circumstances. It was certainly inappropriate for police officers not to display warrant cards. Miss CHEUNG said that if CoP was unable to tell immediately or right now whether those persons were police officers, how the general public could know whether a person covering his face and holding weapons was a police officer. She said that in the past three months, there were already two cases occurred as a consequence of police officers refusing to produce warrant cards. One case took place at Regal Riverside Hotel on 25 October 2019 in which a man impersonating as police officer entered a hotel guest's room and robbed the guest. The other case occurred in Tuen Mun on 1 January where a citizen was intercepted by two men

impersonating as plainclothes police officers, and of course these two culprits did not produce warrant cards. Since earlier there were numerous news clips showing that police officers refused to produce warrant cards upon request by citizens, people generally believed that it was normal for police officers not to produce warrant cards. The result was these two cases of impersonating police officer in robbing. She enquired with CoP how to teach the public to distinguish between masked robbers and masked police officers. In response, CoP said he agreed with what Miss CHEUNG had mentioned that police officers should produce warrant cards as far as practicable. He said that the state and condition captured in the photos were unknown; perhaps someone was preparing to throw gasoline bombs at the time, so police officers needed to protect themselves and were thus unable to take out their warrant card. He reiterated that it was inappropriate for police officers not to produce warrant cards under practicable circumstances.

103. Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said that many police officers placed various odd objects (including slogans and SAR flag) at the place where operational call sign should be displayed. She asked whether this was Police's formal uniform. CoP responded that the place for displaying operational call sign should be used to display operational call sign, and it was inappropriate to put other objects in it or cover the operational call sign. Miss CHEUNG said CoP had mentioned just now that it was inappropriate to call members of the public "cockroach", use vulgar language and not to show operational call sign. She said that although CoP had said earlier that members of the public could lodge complaint on these misdeeds and the IPCC would also conduct investigations accordingly, there was no way for them to lodge a complaint as police officers did not produce their warrant cards. She asked whether CoP, as the top person in charge of the police force, would apologise to the public on behalf of the Police. CoP responded that the Police would follow up on complaints against police officers' misconduct, if any, as long as the time and place of the incidents could be provided.

104. (Some Member asked if any police officers had prevented the media from filming. The reporters present clarified that the Police had not done so) The Vice-chairman played video clips on the "612" incident and a police officer ramming his motorbike into crowds. He first asked CoP where police officers had gone because some Members earlier wanted to ask the Police for help but could not get in touch with them. He said that yesterday he saw dozens of anti-riot police officers clearing a "Lennon Wall". He said that this should be the work of the outsourced cleaning workers of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. Also, he said that earlier a few students of Raimondi College and students of other schools held hands and distributed leaflets peacefully in front of the school, and the Police deployed dozens of police officers to round up, arrest and intimidate them. He believed that all police officers had been deployed to be on duty at these places. Besides, remarking that CoP had repeatedly denied

accusations of police officers breaking the law, he said it was shameful to make such a remark as there was solid evidence proving this. He cited an example that an off-duty police officer brought an extendible baton into the airport on 9 December 2019, but the Police did not arrest him. Similar incidents took place before and after the said incident, only that the persons involved were not police officers but civilians, and they were arrested by the Police. For example, in 2017 a young man, and on the day before the meeting an airport staff member, inadvertently brought an extendible baton into the airport. The Police insisted on instituting prosecution against them, and in the end they were ordered by court to be bound over to be of good behaviour. He reckoned that it was difficult to convince the public with unfair law enforcement. He said that the video clips showed a police officer ramming his motorbike into crowds. He queried that the police officer should be arrested and prosecuted for attempt to commit murder. He opined that the police officer was a rioter, and questioned why the police officer, who was out of control, could be reinstated and continued to be salaried by taxpayers' money, while other citizens, teachers, social workers, students, and civil servants who expressed their views were pursued or even interdicted. He agreed that the current social disputes should be resolved expeditiously and let society return to normal order. However, he believed that the problem should be tackled at source, and police brutality should be stopped with "black cops" brought to justice. He said that there were various sorts of evidence pointing to Police's unfair law enforcement, use of a high level or even shocking violence, and wanton use of tear gas during peaceful assemblies. For example, in a public assembly on 12 June 2019 which had obtained the Letter of No Objection, the Police set up defence lines in front and at the back of the crowds and fired tear gas, which had almost led to a stampede. He said that Police's brutality and harbouring of "black cops" on 12 June had aroused discontent among the public, resulting in the skyrocketing rise in the number of people taking to the street in just a week from one million on 9 June to two million on 16 June. He therefore believed that police brutality was at the root of social strife. Police officers launched indiscriminate attack on civilians on a MTR train on 31 August; rammed motorbike into crowds in November; violently assaulted civilians who had already been subdued; beat people with batons, making them suffered head injuries with blood streaming; shot blind a female reporter and shot a female first-aider in the eye; shot a teacher's lower jaw bone and in the eye, smashing his jaw bone and leaving him almost blinded; and frantically arrested and prosecuted civilians. He reckoned that the police force's wrongdoing was grave, but CoP continued to harbour these black sheep and not even one police officer was prosecuted. This had aroused public indignation, causing them to take to the street and protest. He said that all these explained why the police force was brought into disrepute and became rats on the street. He said that there was no limitation for court proceedings in criminal cases. There was a clear public consensus that those who harboured and condoned black cops would one day have to step down, an independent commission of inquiry would ultimately be established, and trials would

surely come some day. He advised the Police to rethink and retract, as well as to stop abuse of power and indiscriminate arrests, so as to do Hong Kong people justice and let Hong Kong start afresh. He opined that if CoP failed to deal with these black sheeps, the police force should be disbanded and reformed immediately.

105. (The Chairman said that although the speaking time of the Vice-chairman was up, she would let CoP make a brief response. CoP thanked the Chairman for her righteousness by giving him an opportunity to respond.) CoP said he disagreed with allegations made by Members against the Police as a whole, saying that the Police would review all the circumstances that involved the use of force before deciding whether to take follow-up action. In addition, he said that issuing Letter of No Opposition to a public assembly did not mean that participants could throw petrol bombs and smoke grenades, beat people and vandalise facilities in the assembly. He reiterated that as long as someone broke the law, the Police would take enforcement action even if the assembly had obtained the Letter of No Objection. In addition, he disagreed that the Police attacked civilians indiscriminately on 31 August 2019. He reiterated that the Police only entered the station to arrest rioters on that day.

106. The Chairman said that CoP had mentioned just now that more than 7 000 people had been arrested. She, as a female, would like to ask CoP how many cases involving arrested women being raped by police officers inside police stations had been reported. Also, she asked how many arrested persons were taken to the Mainland and how many people were being “suicided”. In response, CoP expressed concern that what the Chairman had mentioned just now were exactly the fake news and rumours circulating around. He said that so far one woman alleged that she was raped, and the Police was investigating the case from the angle of misleading police officers and giving false testimony. As for arrested persons being taken to the Mainland, he said that it was totally untrue. As for the alleged cases of people being “suicided”, he said that he did not know how to handle because the public believed that all those who plunged to death and floating bodies found were killed by the Police. He said these claims were unsubstantiated and had incited hatred against the Police. The Chairman further asked how many officers in the police force came from the Mainland or were Mainland public security bureau officials. CoP responded that every police officer was formally recruited and had formal training.

107. The Chairman said that an impromptu motion on this item was received, which was moved by Mr YIP Kam-lung and seconded by Miss YAM Ka-yi. The wording of the impromptu motion was as follows:

With reference to section 4 of the Police Force Ordinance which stipulates that

“The Commissioner...shall be charged with the supreme direction and administration of the police force.”, condemning the Commissioner of Police, Mr TANG Ping-keung, for ineffective control and conniving at the abuse of power and violence by police officers, for fabricating lies that the public are influenced by fake news, disregarding the facts and calling a stag a horse, and for smearing Hong Kong citizens including protesters, journalists and Legislative/District Council members, as well as for turning a blind eye to the illegal acts of police officers and destroying the rule of law. Requesting the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to immediately establish an independent commission of inquiry into matters including ineffective supervision by the Commissioner of Police as well as police brutality and power abuse, and requesting the Government to sack the Commissioner of Police, Mr TANG Ping-keung, for conniving at police officers’ insult of Hong Kong citizens, so as to get justice done for the people of the Central and Western District.

108. CoP disagreed with the false allegations made against the Police in the impromptu motion and he left the meeting early.

109. DO(C&W) said that it was the Government's stance not to agree with motions that were not based on facts, so government representatives would leave the meeting early.

110. (CoP, DO(C&W) and government representatives left the meeting at this point. The scene was chaotic, some observers shouted in the public gallery.) The Chairman asked those observers who caused disruption to the meeting to leave the conference room immediately. Members asked why CoP could leave before the discussion on the item ended and requested CoP to remain present until the motion was put to vote. The Chairman said that pursuant to the Standing Orders adopted earlier, impromptu motions could be moved during meetings. She said it was shameless for DO(C&W) to walk out, and again requested the security personnel and staff to ask those observers who caused disruption to the meeting to leave the conference room immediately. Members questioned why government representatives could leave the meeting suddenly without finishing their work. The Chairman and some Members requested DO(C&W) to return to the meeting and that the motion be dealt with immediately. Members also requested to put on record and condemn the disrespectful act of DO(C&W) and CoP towards the Council and the meeting.

111. The Chairman said that relevant views could be put forward in the form of a motion, and that the Standing Orders adopted earlier allowed the moving of impromptu motions during meetings. The Chairman once again asked the observers who caused

disturbance to leave the conference room immediately. The Chairman said that according to the Standing Orders adopted earlier, handling of any impromptu motion required the approval from one-third of the Members present. She asked Members about their views on handling of the motion. More than one-third of the Members present supported the handling of the impromptu motion.

112. The Chairman said that more than one-third of the Members present supported the handling of the motion. She reminded Members that according to the past practice of handling motions at C&WDC meetings, voting was conducted by division. The following impromptu motion was adopted after voting:

With reference to section 4 of the Police Force Ordinance which stipulates that “The Commissioner...shall be charged with the supreme direction and administration of the police force.”, condemning the Commissioner of Police, Mr TANG Ping-keung, for ineffective control and conniving at the abuse of power and violence by police officers, for fabricating lies that the public are influenced by fake news, disregarding the facts and calling a stag a horse, and for smearing Hong Kong citizens including protesters, journalists and Legislative/District Council members, as well as for turning a blind eye to the illegal acts of police officers and destroying the rule of law.

Requesting the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to immediately establish an independent commission of inquiry into matters including ineffective supervision by the Commissioner of Police as well as police brutality and power abuse, and requesting the Government to sack the Commissioner of Police, Mr TANG Ping-keung, for conniving at police officers’ insult of Hong Kong citizens, so as to get justice done for the people of the Central and Western District.

(Proposed by Mr YIP Kam-lung and seconded by Miss YAM Ka-yi)

(14 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(1 dissenting vote: Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 abstention vote)

113. The Vice-chairman suggested that the C&WDC should write to the Chief Executive and Secretary for Home Affairs to complain against DO(C&W) for neglect of duty for leaving the meeting without the Chairman's consent and refusing to provide assistance.

114. Mr HO Chi-wang enquired about the reason for DO(C&W) to leave the meeting. The Chairman said she had no idea. Mr HO Chi-wang asked whether DO(C&W) left the meeting because she disagreed with the wording of the motion or because she had other commitments. He said that DO(C&W) could give views on how to revise the wording of the motion, but could not leave the meeting for disagreeing with the motion wording. The Chairman said that DO(C&W) had indicated just now that she disagreed with the motion, though she left the meeting without giving a reason.

115. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that if DO(C&W) would return to the conference room afterwards, he would like to listen to her explanation first; if not, the matter could be determined later. He believed that the meeting should first deal with CoP's walk-out of the meeting, without the Chairman's consent, before discussion on the agenda item "Meeting the Commissioner of Police" ended, which was total disrespect of the C&WDC. He opined that CoP should give a reason and obtain the prior consent from the Chairman before he was allowed to leave. Remarking that this Council had adopted a motion requesting the Government to sack CoP, he considered that CoP's leaving the meeting without prior notice to the Chairman served as an evidence of his disrespect for the C&WDC. Hence, he opined that the Council should write to inform the Chief Executive, Chief Secretary for Administration and Civil Service Bureau about CoP's walk-out of the meeting and disrespect for the C&WDC, and that the Government should sack CoP according to the impromptu motion adopted just now; albeit that such an effort would be futile. As for DO(C&W), he reckoned that consideration should be given to writing to the Secretary for Home Affairs if she did not return to the conference room before the meeting ended.

116. The Chairman agreed to the approach in handling the letter to be issued concerning CoP, whereas the letter concerning DO(C&W) could be handled by the end of the meeting. Mr HO Chi-wang agreed that a letter should be issued to the Chief Executive and Secretary for Home Affairs, and asked whether the meeting would proceed to the subsequent agenda item (i.e. agenda item 7) as relevant guests did not attend the meeting. The Vice-chairman considered it necessary to condemn DO(C&W) because the government representatives, which were guests of the meeting, had already arrived at the conference room, but they left under the lead of DO(C&W). The Chairman suggested that the meeting should continue and re-ordering of agenda items should only



be considered if the guests were absent. The Vice-chairman opined that the failure of C&WDO in assisting the conduct of the meeting had impeded the meeting, and that DO(C&W) should be condemned right away.

117. Mr HUI Chi-fung concurred with Mr KAM's suggestion on handling the matter. He agreed that the meeting should continue, and they should ask the Secretary to contact DO(C&W) and Assistant District Officer (Central and Western) (ADO(C&W)) to invite them to return to the conference room. He reckoned that DO(C&W) was salaried by taxpayers' money and thus should attend Council meetings. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that agenda item 7 required the presence of police representatives and representatives in regular attendance. The Vice-chairman said that the Police had previously replied that they would send representatives to the meeting to join the discussion on agenda item 7. He believed that it was DO(C&W) who encouraged and accompanied the government representatives to leave, so it was necessary to condemn DO(C&W) for neglect of duty.

118. Mr YOUNG Chit-on asked if it was necessary for District Officer to be present at DC meetings. He said that there were examples in the past that meetings could still proceed in the absence of District Officer. The Vice-chairman said that it was not a must for District Officer to be present, but the Secretariat was obliged to assist the conduct of Council meetings. He therefore considered that DO(C&W) had neglected her duties.

119. Mr YIP Kam-lung said that two guests in attendance were seated before the Chairman invited them to. He asked whether this was a procedural problem. The Vice-chairman said that at the time CoP left, DO(C&W) was accompanying him, and that the two guests should not be seated before the Chairman invited them to. Mr MAN Chi-wah, a guest in attendance, said that he was invited to be seated by staff members of the Secretariat. The Chairman invited Mr MAN to leave his seat first and wait for a while in the public gallery. Members asked the guests in attendance not to speak without the consent of the Chairman.

120. The Secretary, in response to Mr YOUNG Chit-on's enquiry, said that although DO(C&W) usually attended C&WDC meetings in the past, there was no provision in the Standing Orders requiring DO(C&W) to attend all meetings of C&WDC. The Secretary said that as far as she understood, DO(C&W) had mentioned before she left that government officials could not agree with anything that was not based on facts. Hence, the government representatives left the meeting early and probably would not return to the conference room to join the meeting. Regarding the Vice-chairman's remark that the Secretariat was required to assist the conduct of Council meetings, she said she would not leave and would continue to perform her duties to assist the conduct of the

meeting.

121. The Vice-chairman considered it ridiculous for DO(C&W) to leave the meeting for disagreeing with Members' stance. He said that pursuant to section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance, one of the functions of DC was to advise the Government, and the government departments should listen to its views. He queried whether the Government required Members to act as megaphones and assist in shielding and defending the regime. He opined that this had set a very bad precedent and should be seriously pursued. The Chairman said that DO(C&W) had left the meeting for 15 minutes. She reckoned that the meeting should proceed with the remaining items on the agenda, and that DO(C&W) should be pursued for walking out of the meeting.

122. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that agenda item 7 was about the Police and two police commanders were supposed to attend the meeting. He asked the Secretary if she could contact the two commanders to confirm whether they were not going to attend the meeting. In addition, he said that the Council had departmental representatives in regular attendance. He asked whether these representatives included DO(C&W), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and Highways Department, and whether there were also other departments. He also asked whether these representatives were not going to return to the conference room as well. The Secretary responded that government representatives in regular attendance at C&WDC meetings included the HKPF, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Transport Department (TD); whereas C&WDO was not among the departmental representatives in regular attendance. She hoped that she would be allowed time to confirm whether the departmental representatives would return to the meeting before giving a response.

(Post-meeting note: Departmental representatives in regular attendance at C&WDC meetings should include the HKPF, CEDD, FEHD, LCSD, TD and C&WDO. Members were informed of the said correction at the first special meeting of C&WDC on 23 January 2020.)

123. The Vice-chairman said that the meeting was in a bad state of affairs. He suggested to draft a public censure statement and lodge a complaint with the Chief Executive and Secretary for Home Affairs. The Chairman said that the meeting would take a 5-minute break for the Secretary to confirm whether the departmental representatives would attend the meeting. (The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break)

124. (After the meeting resumed) The Chairman said that right after CoP met with

C&WDC Members and while Members were handling the impromptu motion, CoP, DO(C&W), ADO(C&W), and representatives of the CEDD, FEHD, TD and LCSD left the meeting and so far had not returned to the conference room. She asked the Secretary if she had contacted the departmental representatives to see whether they would return to the conference room.

125. The Secretary responded that the reply she received was just like what DO(C&W) had mentioned just now, that is, it was the Government's stance in general that any allegation against any department not based on facts was not acceptable to government departments and they could not stay in the meeting. Hence, all the departmental representatives (including representatives in regular attendance at the meeting) would not return to the conference room. The Chairman asked whether departmental representatives would not join this meeting only or would not join all future meetings of the Council. The Secretary responded that as far as she understood, the departmental representatives would not return to join this meeting. The Chairman asked what should be done if the departmental representatives were not going to return to join this meeting.

126. The Chairman sought Members' views on the Secretary's reply. Members' views were as follows:

- (a) Ms NG Hoi-yan said that the departmental representatives were not required to vote on the impromptu motion moved just now, and asked why they could walk out from the meeting simply because they were dissatisfied with the content of the impromptu motion. She said that it was not possible for Members to walk out because of their dissatisfaction with the content of papers submitted by the Government. She therefore requested that the departmental representatives in regular attendance to return to join the meeting and answer questions from Members. She said that in addition to police brutality, topics like district planning, epidemic, etc. would also be discussed at today's meeting, so departmental representatives could not walk out of the meeting like that. She queried whether the Government was trying to paralyse the Council's operation.
- (b) Mr YOUNG Chit-on said he had never seen such an odd situation before. He said that according to the Secretary, the Government's stance was that the departmental representatives had left the meeting and would not return to the conference room. However, he was surprised that as the guests in attendance for the subsequent agenda items were not yet seated, how they could leave if they had not even seated. He said that while it was comprehensible for the departmental representatives who were present just now to leave, it was hardly

convincing for departmental representatives who were not yet present in the conference room not to attend the meeting. He enquired whether the relevant departmental representatives should be present for the discussion on subsequent topics.

- (c) The Chairman said that at 2:00 pm when the meeting started, representatives of four government departments and DO(C&W), in the capacity of representatives in regular attendance, were present. Then CoP joined the meeting and exchanged views with Members. She said that until 4:20 pm, CoP and all other government representatives suddenly walked out of the meeting. She remarked that for agenda item 7, representatives of HKPF should be present to listen to the views of Members. The written reply from HKPF would not suffice. She asked if the Secretary was certain that the representatives of HKPF would not return to join the meeting. The Secretary responded that as far as she understood, all the government representatives would not return to the conference room to join the meeting. If the Council decided to continue with the meeting, staff members of the C&WDC Secretariat would stay in the conference room to provide services, and she would continue to take minutes of the meeting. And just like previous meetings, if departmental representatives failed to attend a meeting, the Secretariat would forward the minutes of meeting to relevant departments for reference and follow-up.
- (d) Mr YIP Kam-lung said that the current situation was a result of CoP leaving the meeting, and then other departmental representatives walked out of the meeting under the lead of DO(C&W), and they would not return to the conference room to join the meeting. As such, he reckoned that even if the meeting was to continue with the discussion on the remaining items on the agenda, it would just like talking to the air. He said that even though the Secretary would continue to take minutes of the meeting, there would be no departmental representatives to give instant response to Members' questions at the meeting. He invited the Secretary to contact DO(C&W) to request the departmental representatives to return to the conference room as there were still a number of agenda items pending discussion. He considered it a disrespect of the popularly elected Council for the Government to ask all departmental representatives to walk out of the meeting for disagreeing with Members' views. He queried whether the Government was practising autocratic rule. He suggested a re-ordering of the agenda items. If relevant departmental representatives were still absent from the meeting at the time when topics other than police brutality were discussed, it would mean that the

Government disregarded the Council and he considered this unacceptable. (The Chairman tried to contact DO(C&W) but to no avail.)

- (e) The Vice-chairman opined that the Chairman needed not call DO(C&W) to ask whether she would return to the meeting. He said that DO(C&W) had put up a posture that it was the Government's stance. He considered it necessary to uphold the dignity of the Council, and suggested drafting a censure statement as he believed that the meeting would not have any actual effect. He said it seemed that the departmental representatives were acting in unison at the time they left the meeting, and it was believed that this was an established policy of the Government. He therefore opined that the Chairman needed not contact DO(C&W) again.
- (f) Mr WONG Weng-chi said that a number of major issues, including epidemic prevention, market hygiene, and bringing the Central and Western District back to normal were pending discussion at this meeting. He said that if the representative of FEHD was also absent, discussion of environmental hygiene issues of public concern would not be possible. He enquired whether FEHD also had to obey police orders now. He doubted that now the Government had given greater weight to politics and the Police than livelihood issues of public concern. He said that they should continue to discuss these important topics even in the absence of departmental representatives, otherwise it would give the Government and the Police pretext that the Council had itself caused an abortion of the meeting. He invited the Secretary to relay to relevant departments views expressed by Members in the discussion on papers. He opined that the walkout by departmental representatives was simply ignoring people's livelihood. While the Government disregarded public health and safety, the Council would not give these up. He reckoned that the Council should discuss the papers first to reach a preliminary conclusion and give suggestions, which should then be put on record in the minutes of the meeting and forwarded to relevant government departments for follow-up.
- (g) The Vice-chairman said that the censure statement had just been drafted and circulated among the messaging group for perusal and comment.
- (h) Ms WONG Kin-ching said that as the departmental representatives were absent, she asked whether the Council needed to decide what topics to discuss next, or whether the Council should discuss all the remaining items on the agenda and then send the minutes of the meeting to relevant government departments for perusal and follow-up. The Chairman said that she would

discuss with Members afterwards about the topics to be discussed next.

- (i) Mr NG Siu-hong said CoP had mentioned just now that district commanders would attend the Council's meetings. However, all the police representatives had left in less than an hour later. He opined that it was necessary to include criticism against CoP for lying in the censure statement.
  
- (j) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that he had been a District Councillor of the Central and Western District for some 20 years and the incident was unprecedented. He said that the Council often had different stance with the Government in the past. But for this meeting, it seemed that the Chief Executive had ordered that non-police government representatives should walk out of the meeting in unison in case the Council had different stance with the Police or if the Police considered that any censure motion passed by the Council was not based on facts. He said that he could reluctantly understand the walkout of CoP and other police officers after being criticised by the Council, but did not understand why other departmental representatives would not return to the conference room. He considered that this was unprecedented and a trample on the popularly-elected Council. He understood that the parliament/local councils and public views were given much respect in the elections in Taiwan, whereas Hong Kong was now ruled by a totalitarian government and only one voice was allowed. He doubted about the need for a popularly-elected council under such circumstances, and said that the current situation was no different from that of North Korea or a council appointed by the Government. He did not understand why an elected council was needed as a platform for all voices. He opined that the Council could issue a censure statement as this was an important matter. He suggested that the Chairman, together with the Chairmen of the other 17 DCs, should make an urgent appointment to meet with the Chief Executive to demand an explanation on the Government's stance and views, as well as on why departmental representatives were reluctant to attend DC meetings to discuss other livelihood issues after DC criticised or had different stance with the Police. He asked whether all DCs needed not convene meetings in future, and whether Hong Kong's society had plunged into such an absurd state. He agreed that a censure statement should be issued and suggested that the Chairman, together with the Chairmen of the other 17 DCs, should make an appointment to meet with the Chief Executive. Besides, he opined that the meeting should continue to discuss the remaining items on the agenda, because many livelihood issues of public concern and motions were covered by the agenda of this meeting. From the stance of the Council, even in the absence of departmental representatives and even if the

Government refused to listen to the voices of the Council, the Council's views should be relayed to government departments for follow-up and response.

- (k) Mr HO Chi-wang said that civil servants should be politically neutral. DC members expressing views that were contrary to Government's directions was not a reason for government officials to walk out from meetings. He opined that the relevant government officials should be condemned as they were paid to perform their duties. In addition, he was concerned that if the Government continued to adopt such an attitude in future whenever any remarks made or motions moved by the Council were contrary to the Government's stance, the operation of the Council would be seriously hindered. Hence, the Council should immediately explore how to prevent the Government from using the same approach to obstruct its operation. He said that this concerned the welfare of the general public. He opined that electors used their votes to elect district councillors to monitor the Government, and often district councillors would hold different views from the Government. It was therefore unacceptable for government officials to leave a meeting on this ground.
- (l) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said that the incident was a very bad precedent. She said that in the dialogue with the Police just now, although the manner of questioning and answers, which took the form of giving immediate answers to Members' questions, was different from that adopted by the Council in the past, it was still a question and answer session on a relatively equal basis. She asked that if the Police still chose to walk out and lead other government departments to declare their political stance in this way, whether other departments could resort to the same approach in the future in case they held different views from the Council. If they could, the Council would be paralysed in which while Members could express their views, government departments needed not give any response or face Members' questions. She therefore opined that such practice should be condemned. In addition, she said that in order to ensure the meeting could continue to discuss various major topics, she concurred with the suggestion by Mr KAM that Members' views should be put on record and relevant government departments should be requested to follow up. Also, she noted that some of the items on the agenda did not concern government departments. She suggested that the Council could contact relevant organisations such as the Urban Renewal Authority to arrange for their representatives to attend the meeting early to facilitate efficient discussion.
- (m) The Vice-chairman said that the meeting was in a bad state of affairs. He

remarked that all civil servants should adhere to political neutrality. He opined that now the Government wanted to set a precedent to "castrate" DCs. The reason was believed to be that the current-term DCs were not dominated by the pro-establishment camp which supported the Government but by pan-democrats. He believed that the Government wanted to change the rules of the entire District Council system in order to suppress DCs. He opined that a DC should perform its duties by advising the Government on matters affecting the well-being of citizens according to section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap 547). It should not be the case that departmental representatives walked out in protest and obstructed the operation of DC when the DC disagreed with the Government's stance. He reckoned that it was apparent that the Government wanted to suppress and dwarf DC. He said that this was absolutely unacceptable and needed to be dealt with in a serious manner, otherwise the functions of DC would be seriously undermined. Hence, he considered it necessary to issue a censure statement expeditiously and meet with the Chief Executive to lodge a complaint, as well as to continue to discuss at this meeting livelihood issues other than those put forward in the papers submitted by government departments. For the papers submitted by government departments, he considered that Members had no responsibility to deal with them as the relevant departmental representatives were not present.

- (n) The Chairman said that this would be a long meeting and she would follow the order of agenda items in conducting the meeting. If it came to her attention that other organisations or government departments could join the meeting at an earlier time, she would contact the relevant parties as soon as possible. Also, she suggested that all the motions could be put to vote at the meeting. She very much hoped that epidemic prevention, which was an important topic of discussion, could be dealt with at the meeting. She asked whether the topic of epidemic prevention for discussion today concerned the Hospital Authority (The Secretary responded that regarding the topic of epidemic prevention for discussion today, representatives of relevant departments and organisations had indicated that they were unable to attend the meeting.). She also pointed out that the meeting would be broadcasted live so that members of the public could watch the meeting proceedings, and she did not recommend curtailing the meeting.
- (n) Mr YIP Kam-lung said that urgent issues such as police brutality and pneumonia should be discussed at the meeting. As for non-urgent issues like Conserving Central, the presence or not of the relevant departmental representatives at the meeting could be used to decide whether these items



would be discussed today. He said that a number of internal affairs had to be dealt with at the meeting, including the establishment of working groups, and therefore did not recommend curtailing the meeting. He also suggested that certain non-urgent items should be re-arranged for discussion at the next meeting.

- (n) Mr YOUNG Chit-on said that the only choices were to continue with the meeting, not to continue the meeting or to discuss only some of the agenda items. He agreed with Mr YIP's remark that for items which required the presence of departmental representatives to make the discussion meaningful, it would be a waste of time to continue discussing them. But they could discuss those items which Members could give advice to the Government first in order to perform the Council's responsibility. He suggested to discuss which items were to be retained for discussion at today's meeting and reach a consensus accordingly.
- (q) The Vice-chairman suggested that all the papers submitted by government departments should not be discussed at the meeting.

127. The Chairman invited Members to review the agenda. She suggested that the meeting should continue to discuss the papers submitted by Members and standing items (i.e. agenda items 7 and 8, 10 to 12, 15 and 16). For agenda item 9 (Oppose to the proposed eating place at the portion of public viewing area and a corridor adjacent to Shop L on public viewing deck level (2/F) of Central Pier No.7 (Star Ferry) (Application No. A/H24/25)), the relevant application had been deferred for two months. The Town Planning Board (TPB) was conducting a public consultation on the Star Ferry site and the consultation period would end in two months' time. She therefore suggested that the topic be discussed at the next meeting. Other papers submitted by government departments (i.e. agenda items 13 and 14) would not be discussed at the meeting. Mr YIP Kam-lung enquired whether Star Ferry and TPB had formal records of the extension of the consultation period regarding the Star Ferry site. He was worried that the deadline for submitting views would be earlier than the date of the next full Council meeting. In response, the Chairman suggested to set up a working group later for focused monitoring. In addition, the Chairman said that agenda item 16 was related to a funding allocation of over \$1 million. She opined that the funding could be used for epidemic prevention. She cited an example that the cleaning packs distributed by ward offices were purchased with the funding allocated by the Food, Environment, Hygiene & Works Committee last year. She hoped that agenda item 16 could also be discussed at the meeting.

128. The Vice-chairman asked Members if they would like to propose any

amendment to the draft censure statement circulated earlier. If not, then the censure statement could be read out to the media. He suggested to the Chairman that the meeting be adjourned for a few minutes for Members to read and agree on the issue of the censure statement. Mr YIP Kam-lung said that Mr YOUNG Chit-on was not in the messaging group and asked whether he needed to be contacted and informed about the matter. Mr YOUNG Chit-on thanked fellow Members for not forgetting him. He suggested that the draft censure statement be released so that Members could have a better grasp of its content. Members suggested displaying the draft censure statement on the screen. The Chairman suggested that the draft censure statement be dealt with before commencing the discussion on agenda item 7. She announced that the meeting would be adjourned for a 2-minute break for Members to read the draft statement. (The meeting adjourned for a 2-minute break)

129. (After the meeting resumed) The Chairman asked Members if they had read the draft censure statement. Mr KAM Nai-wai believed that the walkout by government officials en masse was not the decision of DO(C&W) but the highest instruction of the Chief Executive. Therefore, the last two sentences should be amended to read “District Councillors have the duty to advise the Government rather than just defending it. We strongly condemn the acts of suppressing District Council by the Carrie LAM Administration in order to weaken its functions.” Mr YIP Kam-lung suggested replacing the words “in order to” with “in an attempt to” to indicate that the Council did not fear the Government’s attempt to weaken its functions. The Chairman referred Members to the censure statement, which would be put to vote afterwards before forwarding to the Chief Executive and Chief Secretary for Administration. The Vice-chairman suggested that the censure statement should be forwarded to Executive Council members as well, as they had responsibility to advise the Chief Executive. Also, he requested that the censure statement be read out publicly at this meeting. The Chairman asked the other 14 Members if they needed to sign the censure statement. Mr KAM Nai-wai responded that this was a meeting of the C&WDC and not of the 14 Members, and it would be in order for the Chairman to read out the censure statement if it was adopted afterwards after voting. As for actions, if any, to be taken by Members after the meeting, he suggested that relevant arrangements could be made after the meeting. The Vice-chairman suggested that the censure statement be put to vote first and if adopted, it should be read out by the Chairman at the meeting. The Chairman asked if Members needed to raise further amendments to the censure statement.

130. The Chairman suggested that the Council should proceed to voting on whether to accept the content of the censure statement. The statement, if adopted, should be read out by the Vice-chairman, which would then be signed by her and forwarded to the Chief Executive, Chief Secretary for Administration and all members of the Executive Council.

The following censure statement was adopted after voting:

“This is the darkest day in the history of District Council in Hong Kong. The Commissioner of Police, whilst attending a meeting of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC), denied the occurrence of police brutality, police abuse of power, and indiscriminate arrests and unlawful acts by the Police.

Subsequently, the Commissioner of Police walked out of the meeting with all the police officers present at the scene, including the District Commander (Central District), District Commander (Western District) and police officers in regular attendance who are scheduled to attend the meeting for a subsequent agenda item, at the time when the meeting proceeded with a motion proposed by C&WDC Members to condemn the Commissioner.

It is even more regrettable that Mrs Susanne Wong, District Officer (Central and Western), led some staff members of the Central and Western District Office and all other government officials present to walk out of the meeting.

The excuse used by District Officer (Central and Western), that is, the Government disagreed with the stance of C&WDC Members, is unacceptable. Police affairs have nothing to do with other government departments. The walkout of government officials amounts to disregarding people’s livelihood and putting politics above all else, which violates the principle of political neutrality that civil servants should uphold.

District Councillors have the duty to advise the Government rather than just echoing with and defending it. We believe that the Carrie LAM Administration intends to suppress the voice of District Councillors and weaken the functions of District Council.

We strongly condemn the acts of suppressing District Council by the Carrie LAM Administration in an attempt to weaken its functions!”

(13 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(1 dissenting vote: Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 abstention vote)

131. The Vice-chairman read out the censure statement which was adopted after voting. The Chairman said that the Council had agreed just now to forward the censure statement to the Chief Executive, Chief Secretary for Administration and all members of the Executive Council. In addition, regarding Mr KAM Nai-wai's suggestion for Chairmen of the 18 DCs to meet with the Chief Executive, she said that she had contacted other DC Chairmen and the suggestion was likely to be implemented.

132. The Chairman ended the discussion on this item.

### **Discussion Items**

**Item 7:** { **Stop Police Violence and Restore Calm to Hong Kong**  
(C&W DC Paper No. 21/2020)

**Strongly Condemn the Police for Power Abuse and Violence against Protesters since the Start of the Movement of Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments in June 2019, and Request the Government to Immediately Set Up an Independent Commission of Inquiry to Fully Investigate Police Power Abuse and Violence since 12 June 2019, and to Pursue Responsibilities**  
(C&W DC Paper No. 22/2020)

---

(5:30 pm – 6:30 pm)

133. The Chairman said two of the papers were related to the issue and they would be discussed together. She said the Secretariat had invited HKPF to delegate representatives to the meeting to discuss the issue, and the representatives were Mr TSE Ming-yeung, District Commander (Central District), Ms WONG Siu-hing, District Commander (Western District), Mr TSAI Tung-hung, Police Community Relations Officer (Central District) and Mr YU Kong, Police Community Relations Officer (Western District). She said the four representatives had left the meeting at an earlier time and she wished to reserve their seats. She said four representatives of the public would speak on the item and they were Mr MAN Chi-wah, Mr LUI Hung-pan, Mr CHAN Chit-kwai and Mr TSUI King-sing respectively. She welcomed the four representatives of the public and asked them to take a seat. She invited Members who had submitted the papers to first give supplementary information on the papers.

134. Mr KAM Nai-wai said according to the reply of HKPF, HKPF was “strongly

dissatisfied with the misleading title of the paper and found it unacceptable”. He reiterated that they had no opportunity to discuss the issue with the representatives of HKPF in the meeting and he hoped that HKPF could stop calling protesters “rioters”. He opined that if a protestor conducted illegal or violent acts, HKPF could define the acts but should not call that person “a rioter”. He said he would call the police “black cops” in future meetings if they continued to call protesters “rioters”. He hoped that HKPF could respect C&WDC. As for HKPF replying that HKPF was “strongly dissatisfied with the misleading title of the paper and found it unacceptable”, he hoped that HKPF could stop being an ostrich. At the moment, 40% to 50% of the public did not trust the police at all and it revealed that the situation was not actually “misleading” or “unacceptable”, like what HKPF had said. It was just that the police was unwilling to face the reality. He pointed out that the root problem would not be solved if the police continued to be “strongly dissatisfied” and find things “unacceptable”, and refused to face the reality. He commented that the relation between the police and the public could not be fostered if HKPF continued to communicate with members of the public who held different views in this manner.

135. The Vice-chairman described the reply of HKPF as unbelievable and seemingly unprecedented. He said Members condemned HKPF for abusing its power and violence since the start of the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments but HKPF criticised the title of the paper for being “misleading” and “unacceptable”, and said they were “strongly dissatisfied” in the reply. He remarked that HKPF should attend the meeting and participate in the discussion if they were “strongly dissatisfied” and found the title “unacceptable”. He questioned whether it was not even allowed to discuss the problems and whether they wanted to turn Hong Kong into a “police city”. He opined that HKPF was impervious to reason or advice, and it even overrode the law and acted superciliously. He opined that the police force was corrupted, and it should be disbanded and reformed immediately. Besides, he said the issue was related to police brutality and the request to set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry. As the police would definitely not agree with the demands and it was not within their capacity to address the matters, he had requested the Chief Secretary for Administration to delegate representatives to the meeting. However, the request was turned down by him. He commented that the act completely disregarded public opinion and reduced C&WDC to a rubber stamp, intending to stifle the voices of C&WDC led by the pan-democratic camp. He suggested writing to the Chief Executive to condemn the Chief Secretary for Administration for not delegating any representative to the meeting. He opined that it went against the policy in which the Chief Executive asked all Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureau to make district visits and listen to opinions.

136. Mr YIP Kam-lung commented that the reply of HKPF was absolutely

ridiculous. Like what Miss YAM Ka-yi had said, HKPF had no authority to teach Members how to work. He opined that the CoP failed to manage his subordinates. He connived in the police beating people with baton and shooting people with gun indiscriminately, and he taught Members to work together with the police. He said he also wished to work together with the police but every time when he was stuck in a traffic jam on Queen's Road West and telephoned Western Division Police Station Report Room, no one picked up the calls. He said that according to what the CoP had just said, the public should verify with the police. However, the public could not find the police at all. He quoted the "721" incident in Yuen Long as an example and said HKPF was only on the scene 39 minutes after the public made the first phone call. He opined that the reply of HKPF was unacceptable and he criticised HKPF for leaving the meeting collectively with other departmental representatives. HKPF acted as if it was "the person-in-charge" of Hong Kong and ordered other government departments to be under its command. They left the meeting collectively when things did not go their way. He opined that the practice was illogical and violated the principles of a civilised society. He was extremely angry about it.

137. Mr NG Siu-hong said the CoP had undertaken just then that HKPF would delegate representatives to attend different meetings of C&WDC to listen to Members' opinions on police's law enforcement. However, District Commander (Central District) and District Commander (Western District), who had promised to attend the meeting, had also left once the CoP left. He commented that even the CoP lied. He said both police officers of the Police Community Relations Office and Inspectors spoke in a very provocative manner in the corridor just then. He opined that an independent inquiry must be conducted and such a police force must be reformed, in order to have the bad apples punished. He urged members from the pro-establishment camp not to harbour police officers who violated the regulations and performed badly because it would only harm the society, instead of benefitting it.

138. The Chairman opined that the reply of HKPF was unacceptable.

139. Miss YAM Ka-yi said Members were angry at the reply of HKPF because Members asked HKPF questions and raised queries based on public opinion and the questions were factual. The questions included, for example, how many complaints and reports had the Complaints Against Police Office and IPCC received so far, how many cases had already been under investigation, and how many cases had been closed. However, five whole paragraphs in the reply of HKPF beat around the bush. HKPF seemed to be teaching how Members should work and giving a "great" lecture. She opined that the practice was definitely inappropriate. She said the practice was just like how the Junior Police Officers' Association of the Hong Kong Police Force had made a

statement to condemn the Chief Secretary for Administration, asking him not to apologise on behalf of the police force; and it was like how the Superintendents' Association, the Hong Kong Police Inspectors' Association, the Overseas Inspectors' Association and the Junior Police Officers' Association wrote to criticise a Member of Parliament who belonged to the Labour Party of the United Kingdom and asked her to apologise for criticising the police force. She said all the acts were ultra vires and should not be conducted. She requested putting her comments on record and hoped that the same situation would not arise again. She said some might comment that Members had interrupted the CoP when the CoP was exchanging views with Members. She explained that Members were asking factual questions and yes-no questions but the CoP did not give a straightforward answer and he kept beating around the bush. Miss YAM commented that he was wasting C&WDC's time and his behaviour was unreasonable. She publicly urged HKPF to attend C&WDC meetings. She opined that voices of the public could be heard and the relation between the police and the public could be mended only if HKPF attended the meetings. She believed that it would be what the attendees and the public wished to see.

140. The Chairman said the paragraphs which mentioned "rioters" in the reply of HKPF went way too far. She hoped that those paragraphs could be deleted.

141. Mr HUI Chi-fung condemned HKPF for the continuous police brutality. He said it was dereliction of duty when the police was absent in the solemn C&WDC meeting just because the police held a different political stance. He said other civil servants who had left the meeting, including representatives of CEDD, FEHD, LCSD and TD, together with some other government officials in regular attendance who were supposed to attend the meeting, all neglected their duties. He asked since when the Government had become so corrupt that civil servants were allowed to neglect their duties just because of different political stances. He remarked that civil servants were paid out of the public purse and asked why they did not need to be accountable to members of C&WDC who were elected by the public. He expressed strong condemnation of it. He pointed out that the problem of police brutality had become very serious. Since 12 June, the problem of police brutality was like the opened Pandora's Box. He remarked that the "612" incident took place because HKPF first defined the peaceful protestors as rioters and first fired tear gas, used baton and shot the public indiscriminately. The vision of some member of the public was permanently damaged because HKPF used force. Many innocent members of the public were also injured because they could not leave in time. He opined that the "612" incident was the catalyst of the whole movement and HKPF was definitely unforgivable. The public would not forgive the Government either. He was extremely dissatisfied with the police force and he condemned the force. He said the current police force was like "mice on the streets" and its reputation was worse these days than in the

70s. They behaved just like the triad society. He wished to represent his voters to keep a formal record and make a statement regarding their hatred, anger and condemnation towards HKPF.

142. Mr HO Chi-wang said C&WDC had made a statement just then condemning acts including the CoP leading his subordinates, including District Commander (Central District) and District Commander (Western District) to leave the meeting. He expressed deep regret over the fact that the paper was only discussed by Members and received no response from officials. He said while HKPF seemed to be teaching Members to work together with HKPF in the reply, the representatives of HKPF left the meeting. He did not understand how they could work together with HKPF. He said HKPF might not pay attention to the discussion on the paper held by Members but he hoped that the public, especially those who were watching the live broadcast, saw how HKPF behaved in the meeting and knew whether the police was really working for the community.

143. Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said besides wanting to know about some figures in general, another intention of submitting the paper was to make improvements in future regarding the incidents happened. As an effective communication required interactions and exchanges of ideas, it was necessary for HKPF to attend the meetings. She expressed regret that HKPF was not at all sincere in answering to the residents together with elected Members in the meeting. She opined that discussion of the day was not quite meaningful and they could only condemn HKPF for not attending the meeting or disregarding public opinion. She hoped that when C&WDC discussed district affairs which were related to HKPF in future, HKPF would not miss the meetings like in the past or leave the meeting collectively in a high-profile manner like today.

144. The Chairman said some residents had commented just then that Members were like declaring war. She clarified that Members were not declaring war; it was HKPF who declared war. It was a disrespectful act to Members when HKPF left the meeting collectively. She said that according to the CoP, HKPF should not call protestors “cockroaches” and use profanities. However, the CoP’s body language expressed how he treated C&WDC. She opined that it was a form of violence committed by government officials.

145. The Chairman invited Mr MAN Chi-wah, representative of the public, to speak on the item. Mr MAN Chi-wah said he had not clapped or shouted just then in the public gallery; he simply said “DC should be open and democratic” and he was asked to leave subsequently. He continued that earlier he took a seat at the meeting table as instructed by the staff of the Secretariat, but was asked by Members to leave right after he sat down, because “the Chairman had not invited him”. He said the request could be made in a



more respectful manner even if “the Chairman had not invited him”. The departmental representatives left the meeting collectively because respect should be mutual but not unilateral. As for police brutality, he said no violent incidents occurred when the Chairman asked people to leave just then. He said that when a person used violence, the other person would also use violence. If C&WDC opined that throwing bricks and breaking glasses were not violent, then C&WDC was problematic. He remarked that the photos displayed in front of Members’ seats only reflected one side of the problem but not the other. For example, there was also footage showing that protestors used umbrellas as camouflage and meted out punishment privately. He said such a situation would make him worried if he would also be “lynched” privately after speaking in the meeting. He asked whether throwing bricks, removing railings and destroying traffic lights were violent, and he questioned why the acts were not condemned and only HKPF was condemned. He said HKPF might have made some mistakes but he asked whether it was possible to solve the predicament. He did not understand why the police force should be disbanded and why HKPF should be held accountable. He opined that some wanted HKPF to be held accountable because they hoped that Hong Kong would lose its defence and its rule of law, and the Liberation Army could as a result go into action. International attention could then be drawn and Members of the pan-democratic camp could then advance the independence of Hong Kong.

146. The Chairman would like to invite Mr LUI Hung-pan, representative of the public, to speak on the item. However, as Mr LUI had already left the meeting, the Chairman invited Mr CHAN Chit-kwai, representative of the public, to speak on the item.

147. Mr CHAN Chit-kwai said he appreciated C&WDC for preserving the longstanding tradition of C&WDC and allowing the public to speak in the meetings to air different views. He said he was an experienced DC member whose term of office had just ended. He had been in touch with many members of the public in the previous 28 years and he opined that he could represent them to a certain extent. He felt heartbroken over the unrest and continuous violence arisen from amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance since June 2019. He said a number of rioters continuously damaged the public infrastructure in the society, such as tiles, railings and traffic lights, in the recent eight months, causing public safety issues. They also vandalised restaurants, banks and shops, MTR stations and railways of Light Rail many times, forcing the shops to cease operation again and again and extensively affecting the everyday life of the public. He opined that the problems were caused by the violent acts conducted by some rioters and black-clad masked people, and the public could watch relevant news coverage on television every day. Besides, as traffic had been affected, people who needed to go to hospital for emergency services, medical services or urgent matters were seriously delayed. He opined that the situation had to be rectified as early as possible so that the

public could return to their normal life. He did not agree with the majority of Members that the responsibility for the unrest fell on the police who enforced the law in the society, as the police was responsible for upholding the rule of law and arresting rioters. He commented that this kind of violent incidents would become more common, vandalism would become more wanton and the punishment meted out would become crueller if there was no police in the society. He said according to a foreign friend of his, a black-clad rioter would have been suppressed by force high-handedly if he carried out the same acts in Australia. He opined that Hong Kong Police was restrained in accordance with international standards and he hoped that the public could be fair to Hong Kong Police. He supported the police force because they had sweated blood to protect Hong Kong people over the past six months. He believed that the police force would impartially take disciplinary action against police officers who were found guilty of misconduct.

148. The Chairman invited Mr TSUI King-sing, representative of the public, to speak on the item. As Mr TSUI had already left the meeting, the Chairman invited Members to ask questions and express their views. Members' comments were as follows:

- (a) Mr YIP Kam-lung remarked that Mr MAN, as a former DC member, gave a speech which did not adhere to Central and Western District Council Standing Orders or did not observe the rules. He opined that Mr MAN disregarded the dignity of C&WDC and he was very dissatisfied with Mr MAN's behaviour. He suggested that the Chairman refer to the record kept for the day when Mr MAN wanted to speak in C&WDC meetings in future in order to rule whether she would approve of it. He commented that Mr MAN should not take a seat at the meeting table before the Chairman invited him to. He opined that Mr MAN had brought up many fallacies just then. Those were all remarks favoured by people from the pro-Government camp and were unfair. He said that according to Mr MAN, Members' views were one-sided and "the police was violent only because the rioters were violent". However, he opined that the police force was the one who first used violence on 12 June. He said a large group of people would not surround the Legislative Council Complex and Central Government Offices if the police did not intend to attack the public suddenly. The police later even took advantage of the situation, and fired tear gas and addressed journalist with vulgar language. All the acts showed that it was the police force that provoked the conflicts. He remarked that the root problem was that the Government refused to listen to public opinion and so, he said "Five demands, not one less" and "Liberate Hong Kong, the revolution of our times".

- (b) Miss YAM Ka-yi said she wanted to give clarification in response to the comments made by some members of the public just then. They commented just then that Members only saw one side of the problem and only pointed out the police's mistakes. She reiterated that the job of Members was to monitor government departments. The purpose of writing to HKPF was to ask questions and certainly, they were addressing HKPF. She opined that it was unreasonable to request Members to talk about other stances under the circumstance. She opined that Mr MAN's basic concept was flawed and it was incorrect to say that "there would be no rule of law if there was no police". She said Hong Kong implemented a tripartite political system under which there was separation of executive, legislative and judicial powers, and the police was responsible for enforcing the law. C&WDC now questioned HKPF because HKPF enforced the law unfairly. The rule of law was upheld by the court and the court, instead of the police, would determine if an individual was guilty. She hoped that Mr MAN could be clear about the concepts.
- (c) Mr NG Siu-hong said according to Mr MAN, people who were against police brutality wanted to advocate "Hong Kong independence". He opined that no Members intended to advocate "Hong Kong independence". They simply wanted to curb police brutality and set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry. He said given that both sides opined that the views of the other was one-sided, a credible Independent Commission of Inquiry could be set up to ascertain the truth and address the problems. He opined that it was not an act of patriotism and would only harm the country when the pro-establishment camp or the self-proclaimed patriots called people who supported democracy and the implementation of universal suffrage, as prescribed by the Basic Law, "people who supported Hong Kong independence". He said the pro-Government camp needed to bear the responsibility for the failure of "one country, two systems".
- (d) Ms NG Hoi-yau opined that Mr MAN did not comprehend the papers. She said the papers described situations that had happened when the police enforced the law. She said violent incidents, such as beating arrestees even after they were subdued, occurred when the police enforced the law. The papers aimed to reflect the problem and did not aim to advocate "Hong Kong independence". "Hong Kong independence" or relevant implications were not mentioned in the papers either. She said that according to the police, their job was to "safeguard and protect life and property" but routine patrol was absent in the community. She questioned whether HKPF was still

discharging the duty. She pointed out that she saw two to three police officers patrolled on the streets from time to time in the past but now she saw none. However, close to 50 police officers accompanied the CoP to join the meeting and some police officers also stationed nearby, proving that HKPF did have sufficient manpower to maintain routine patrols in the community. She asked why such arrangements were not made. She hoped that HKPF could give a reply when it followed up the issue later, as there was no representative of HKPF in the meeting at that moment.

- (e) Mr KAM Nai-wai opined that minions of the Communist Party overplayed the issue by saying that Hong Kong people supported “Hong Kong independence” and wanted independence for Hong Kong. He said they were fighting for “the liberation of Hong Kong” but not “Hong Kong independence”. He suggested that the two representatives of the public read an article written by Dr LO Chi-kin, which said, “the Government might not understand the stance of ‘the peaceful, rational and non-violent protesters’”. The Government hoped that they would distance themselves from the valiant protesters because of the increasingly common frontline violence. However, if the Government did come down to earth to listen to the voice of the public and earnestly reflect on their mistakes, then they would understand why ‘the peaceful, rational and non-violent protesters’ did not distance themselves from the valiant protesters. The reason is simple yet very strong: the regime ‘went too far’”. He opined that “went too far” meant the Government neglecting the fact that over a million people took to the streets. Hong Kong was even turned into a “police city”. Abuse of violence by the police and their malicious prosecution had also posed a safety problem to the public when they went out. He asked the minions of the Communist Party to see the facts clearly.
- (f) The Vice-chairman said the royalist camp, people from the pro-establishment camp, the Chief Executive and HKPF all spoke with one voice. They only talked about the damage caused by the public but mentioned nothing related to police brutality. For instance, they said nothing about the “831” incident, the shooting in Tsuen Wan, the shooting in Sai Wan Ho or the incident in which a motorcycle was driven into a crowd on 11 November, etc. He asked the powers that be and the royalist camp whether a pane of glass or a human eye was more important, and whether damaging the turnstiles or beating up people till they bled was more severe. He asked why the powers that be did not get to the root of the problem or think about why the public was left with no choice but to take to the streets. He said many arrestees were young people with a bright future ahead. They were students from elite schools and university

students, and they were the future pillars in the society. He asked why the Government had to drive them to desperation. He opined that the root problem was police brutality. He said 1 million people took to the streets peacefully on 9 June. However, as the police abused violence on 12 June, 2 million people were provoked and took to the streets on 16 June. He opined that the biggest problem was that the police continued to connive in police brutality and no police officer had been charged so far. The public was deeply aggrieved at it. He opined that it had also completely trampled on the dignity of Hong Kong people and destroyed the core values of Hong Kong. That was the reason why the public would never give up. Even if they were beaten up and arrested by the police, they would still come out to express their views. Hence, he remarked that the ultimate way to resolve the problem was to immediately put a stop to police brutality and to do the public justice. He pointed out that a request had been made to set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry regarding the issue but the Government wanted to fool the public by suggesting setting up an Independent Review Committee. He opined that an Independent Commission of Inquiry was important because it could investigate the entire process and make up for the shortcomings of IPCC. Hence, he opined that it must be done. The Government just wanted to avoid responding to the public's demands and confuse the public by suggesting setting up an Independent Review Committee. He reiterated that the nature of an Independent Review Committee was unlike that of an Independent Commission of Inquiry because an Independent Review Committee had no investigation powers, could not call witness in a compellable manner, had no power to decide who would be the responsible person and could not compel the Government to accept its recommendations. He requested all fellow Members to support the motion to set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry.

- (g) Mr WONG Weng-chi responded to Mr MAN. He said no Members opined that monitoring HKPF equalled advocating Hong Kong independence. He remarked that any person who had received tertiary education would know that it was jump thinking and was incorrect. Besides, he said although the Chief Executive suggested setting up an Independent Review Committee, the committee would only review the overall problems in the society. He agreed that it was necessary to review the whole incident but he also opined that setting up an Independent Committee of Inquiry was necessary. He said as mentioned earlier that in the 60s and 70s, the problems of police corruption and misfeasance could only be addressed by setting up the Independent Commission Against Corruption which was directly accountable to the

Governor of Hong Kong. He said they were facing another big problem concerning the police in the history of Hong Kong, he believed that only a committee with a considerable scale and power could bring an end to the situation. He said residents, especially those who lived in the west of Sheung Wan, would be on tenterhooks if the problem of police brutality was not addressed. He said there was no more protest in the district in the past few months but still, many residents and members of the public were searched. He said Mr YIP Kam-lung had also been brought to a police station before and he hoped that the situation would not occur again in Western District.

- (h) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai said the speech of the two members of the public demonstrated why communication broke down between the Government and the police force and the public. He opined that DCs and LegCo were dominated by the royalist camp and the pro-Communists in the past because of the system. Hong Kong was in such a situation because they did not know what Hong Kong people wanted and relayed public opinion inaccurately to the Government and the police force. He believed Hong Kong people were very realistic. No Hong Kong people would be willing to make such a big sacrifice, leaving no stone unturned in taking to the streets and protesting in a radical manner, if the system or the peaceful protests could settle problems and could help them get what they demanded. He opined that Mr CHAN, Mr MAN and their supporters should reflect on who was the mastermind behind the incident that drove a group of young people who had a bright future ahead into desperation, before blaming the protesters or young people.
- (i) Mr KAM Nai-wai added that some always said Members mentioned nothing about violence committed by the protesters. He said he was against any form of violence. He pointed out that the protesters needed to bear very severe legal consequences if they conducted illegal acts, and they might get a prison sentence of 10 years or more. He asked the society or the Government to reflect on why the protesters still conducted such acts despite knowing that there would be very severe legal consequences. He wished to ask HKPF the following eight questions on behalf of the public:
- (i) Will HKPF immediately re-investigate the many cases of “being suicided” occurred in the past and a recent suicide case occurred in the Disciplined Services Quarters in Yau Tong, which are deemed not suspicious by HKPF but very suspicious by the public?
- (ii) Regarding HKPF’s request to arm police officers with stun guns, is it still necessary to do so when the public has no trust in HKPF at the

moment? Will the act intensify the tension between the police and the public? Will the plan to arm police officers with stun guns be cancelled?

- (iii) Why the police officers who shot students in the recent two incidents need not be interdicted from duty and investigated, while in the past a police officer who fired shot has to be interdicted from duty and investigated?
- (iv) Is there any discipline when the police keep interfering in politics, like when police officers at the rank-and-file level criticised Chief Secretary for Administration, Chief Executive and a Vice Chancellor of a university? Is there any disciplinary investigation?
- (v) It has been over six months and why investigation results concerning complaints against the police are still not available?
- (vi) Operational call signs are not wanted. When will police officers display their police identification numbers again when they perform their duties?
- (vii) Why don't the plainclothes police officers, who are armed with guns and stayed on guard, produce their warrant cards as they are not in a critical situation?
- (viii) Why do police officers need to cover their faces when performing duties if they are righteous? Are the masked police officers trying to evade responsibilities and conduct illegal acts? When will they remove their masks?

149. The Chairman hoped that the Secretary could put it on record and she requested the four representatives of HKPF, who were absent from the meeting at the last minute, to give a reply. She worried that HKPF would refuse to give a reply. She said she was utterly disappointed with the whole Government and she opined that taxpayers were very furious.

150. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he had a lot of questions regarding the two papers on the issue so he would actively submit papers to Constitutional & Security Affairs Committee for discussion. He urged other Members to actively submit papers too. He agreed with Miss YAM Ka-yi that Mr MAN's concept of "rule of law" was wrong when he criticised Members or protesters for undermining the rule of law. He opined that

people who destroyed the rule of law must be people who were powerful, and it was HKPF, but not the Chief Executive, that was the most powerful in Hong Kong nowadays. Indeed, it was not even the CoP, but the police officers at the rank-and-file level, who were the most powerful. He opined that it was the people who exercised public powers undermined the rule of law. According to Article 2 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, "All power in the People's Republic of China belongs to the people". He said Hong Kong was like a colony with a different colonial ruler. On the surface, Hong Kong people were administering Hong Kong but in fact, the anti-democracy royalist camp continued to dominate LegCo and be the yes-man of the Central Government in the Government. They did not care at all Hong Kong people or public opinion. He said only those who were in possession of power could make a coup successful. He said the CoP leaving the meeting collectively with other government departments was a coup of civil servants which disregarded the public.

151. The Chairman invited Members to vote on the motions related to the paper titled "Stop police violence and restore calm to Hong Kong" (Paper No. 21/2020).

152. The following five motions were adopted after voting:

- Motion:
- (1) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands the establishment of a statutory independent commission of inquiry to fully investigate events opposing the proposed legislative amendments, including a full investigation into the illegal acts of police officers.
  - (2) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands the prosecution and punishment of police officers who have breached the law, and they should be subject to immediate interdiction and investigation.
  - (3) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands police officers to display their identification numbers when executing their duties.
  - (4) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands plainclothes police officers to produce their warrant cards when executing their duties.
  - (5) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands police officers not to cover their face and hide their identity when executing police operations regarding the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments.



(Proposed by Mr KAM Nai-wai and seconded by Ms NG Hoi-yan)

Motions (1) to (3) and (5)

(14 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(1 dissenting vote: Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 abstention vote)

Motion (4)

(14 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(0 dissenting vote)

(1 abstention vote: Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

153. The Chairman invited Members to vote on the motions related to the paper titled “Strongly condemn the Police for power abuse and violence against protesters since the start of the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments in June 2019, and request the Government to immediately set up an independent commission of inquiry to fully investigate police power abuse and violence since 12 June 2019, and to pursue responsibilities” (Paper No. 22/2020).

154. The following two motions were adopted after voting:

- Motion: (1) Strongly condemning the use of inappropriate and unnecessary violence by the Police against protesters since the start of the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments in June 2019.
- (2) Strongly demanding the Government to immediately establish an independent commission of inquiry to fully investigate the

Police's use of violence in law enforcement and power abuse since 12 June 2019, and to pursue responsibilities.

(Proposed by Mr YEUNG Sui-yin and seconded by Mr HUI Chi-fung)

Motions (1) and (2)

(14 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(1 dissenting vote: Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 abstention vote)

155. The Chairman ended the discussion on this item.

**Item 8: Request the Government to Promptly Bring the Community of Central and Western District Back to Normal**  
**(C&W DC Paper No. 20/2020)**

---

(6:30 pm – 7:47 pm)

156. The Vice-chairman asked if the Members who submitted the paper had anything to add.

157. Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired about the departmental representatives who originally agreed to attend today's meeting for this agenda item.

158. The Vice-chairman responded that the representatives included Mr TSE Ming-yeung, District Commander (Central District) of the HKPF, Ms WONG Siu-hing, District Commander (Western District) of the HKPF, Mr TSAI Tung-hung, Police Community Relations Officer (Central District) of the HKPF, Mr YU Kong, Police Community Relations Officer (Western District) of the HKPF, Mr CHENG Kwan Nang, Senior Engineer/Central and Western of the TD, Ms LI Yat-fung, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western) of the FEHD, Mrs WONG HO Wing-sze, DO(C&W), Mr HO Wing-hong, Manager - External Affairs of MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL), Mr Rico WONG, Operations Manager - Island Line, South Island Line & Tseung Kwan O Line of MTRCL, and Miss Lilian YEUNG, Public Relations Manager - External Affairs of MTRCL. The Vice-chairman said that except MTRCL's representatives, other

departmental representatives had already left the meeting.

159. Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired whether the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and Highways Department (HyD) had promised to send representatives to the meeting. The Secretary responded that both departments had not.

160. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that since only MTRCL's representatives attended today's meeting, he wished to let the representatives know that it was a pity to see the damage done to MTR facilities, which had caused great inconvenience to the public. As he had said just now, he did not support protesters' acts of vandalism against public facilities. However, he was puzzled by some situations. He cited as example a demonstration which took place at a location east to the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the Central Liaison Office (LOCPG), and remarked that there were also other demonstration activities taking place on Queen's Road Central and Queen's Road West concurrently. There was no indication of which MTR stations would be closed at that time, but trains were already not stopping at Kennedy Town Station, thus making some citizens unable to go home. Nevertheless, at the time all the demonstration activities were held in areas east to Sai Ying Pun Station. He understood the reasons for and concerns about trains not stopping at HKU Station, but it would provide convenience to people going to the Southern District if trains could stop at Kennedy Town Station. He hoped that MTRCL's representatives could relay to the Chairman of MTRCL that given the MTR, now nicknamed the "Communist Party's Railway", was part of the public transport system, it should not refuse to serve any members of the public because of their identity, whether they were black-clad people or white-clad people. If MTR refused to serve some members of the public because they were black-clad people, then it was having a political role to play, and that was why it was now called the "Communist Party's Railway". He was concerned that if MTR continued to play a political role, vandalism of station facilities would continue and the public would be affected. He hoped MTRCL would review the situation.

161. The Vice-chairman invited MTRCL to take note of Mr KAM Nai-wai's comments.

162. The Vice-chairman invited discussion on the paper. He said that there were quite a number of items on the agenda, so only one round of discussion would be held. Questions and comments raised by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr YIP Kam-lung believed that no one would hate without a reason. He hoped MTRCL would understand that MTR was much loved by the Hong Kong public eight months ago. He said that some protesters were

very lovely as they would leave some coins near the single-ride ticketing machines. They were also very obedient and would not jump over turnstiles, and even considered that MTR was good in helping people reach different destinations. He said that despite his dislike for MTR and TD's policy of making railway the backbone of the public transport system, at that time he believed that public transport companies should have no political stance and MTR was performing well. He reiterated that MTR was much loved by the Hong Kong public then, and cited an example that some people even urged others not to cause damage to MTR during the movement. However, he reckoned that these good performances were gone forever after the dispatch of special trains by MTRCL to pick up protesters was considered by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China as an act of helping the "rioters". He said that police officers were "rioters" instead because they did not wear or display their warrant cards and used firearms indiscriminately. He understood that the reason for MTRCL to dispatch special trains to pick up protesters was because they had purchased tickets, and MTRCL as a corporation had the responsibility to perform its obligation for the tickets sold. He asked whether MTRCL's subsequent train service adjustment to complement the Police's operations and refusal to make public the CCTV footage to dispel the doubts of the public were its due responsibility as a public transport company.

- (b) Miss YAM Ka-yi pointed out that she and the Hong Kong public loved to take MTR in the past, but now she felt scared whenever passing by MTR stations or entering the station area. She believed that the general public also had the same feeling. She cited examples that MTRCL had dispatched special trains to pick up police officers to facilitate their performance of duties and felt indifferent towards police officers' jumping over turnstiles, and said the public were deeply disappointed about MTRCL's tacit approval of these behaviours. Regarding the Central and Western District, MTRCL had closed Sai Ying Pun Station and HKU Station several times without reason, and so far HKU Station Exit A had not yet re-opened. She asked whether MTRCL could provide the exact date for re-opening of HKU Station Exits A1 and A2 as the University of Hong Kong would resume classes on 20 January. It would cause inconvenience to the public if the exits remained closed.
- (c) Ms WONG Kin-ching remarked that ever since the movement took place, MTRCL had adopted a different approach in handling the opening

and closing of stations and crowd control. She asked whether MTRCL had received any instructions or under any pressure from the Government, including expropriation of trains for whatever purposes, request for opening/closing of stations at specific times, etc. Secondly, she asked if there were indeed such instructions, which government department was responsible for making the decision, and whether MTRCL had put implementation of the Government's requests above the needs or interests of the public.

163. In response to Members' questions, Mr HO Wing-hong, Manager - External Affairs of MTRCL, thanked Members for giving MTRCL the opportunity to listen to their views. He would like to respond to the questions from the perspective of MTRCL. He said he just learned that Members were very concerned about the closure of stations. He pointed out that the arrangement was not just for stations in the Central and Western District, but also applied to the entire MTR network. He said that over a period of time in the past, MTRCL had made corresponding train service adjustment in response to public order events in various districts in light of the actual situation at that time. The major consideration at the time was safety, including the safety of passengers, the entire railway system and frontline staff members of all stations. This was the due responsibility of MTRCL. Besides, MTRCL needed to consider the situation at the time and make accurate decision within a short period of time, so as to take into account the safety factor mentioned just now. He said Members had mentioned just now that MTRCL had adjusted its train service in areas where there were no "large-scale confrontations or chaotic situations", including closure of some of the entrances/exits or the whole stations, or even suspension of train service of a particular railway line under critical conditions. These measures had been adopted based on comprehensive consideration. He cited an example that while some stations were fairly peaceful, but if the stations in the periphery were in undesirable conditions, they would also need to take into account that people might reach these relatively chaotic places by travelling on MTR. Secondly, MTRCL could not make independent decisions on matters relating to safety consideration and risk assessment. In many cases, communication with government departments was necessary in light of the actual situation at the time. For example, MTRCL needed to communicate with the TD or Police on the latest situation to make a comprehensive decision, so as to ensure the safety of railway operation and passengers. Regarding police officers using trains at the time when railway service was suspended, he said that MTRCL would report to the Police in case train station was maliciously damaged and in chaotic situation, or of severe disruption of railway network's order, or station facilities were severely damaged, or personal safety of staff were being threatened. There were indeed police officers taking trains, after MTRCL made a report to the Police, in order to reach the scene promptly to deal with emergencies at that time. MTRCL had also allowed the Police to

use trains in light of road conditions, and MTRCL was not clear about the specific law enforcement procedures of the Police. In addition, Mr HO said that just like Members, MTRCL was also very concerned about the reinstatement works for HKU Station. Due to the serious damage to HKU Station, MTRCL was racing against time in order to reopen the station expeditiously. He said that Mr Rico WONG, Operations Manager - Island Line, South Island Line & Tseung Kwan O Line, would further respond on matters relating to HKU Station.

164. Mr Rico WONG, Operations Manager - Island Line, South Island Line & Tseung Kwan O Line of MTRCL, responded that HKU Station had repeatedly suffered serious damages since 11 November. The station was vandalised again after the exits were closed, rendering Exits A1, A2 and C1 unusable at that time. After assessment, it was noted that many facilities had been damaged, such as the lifts at the exits. He remarked that it might not be possible to see the degree of damage from the outside, but in fact many lift doors were found prised open and many miscellaneous items had been thrown into the lifts. As the degree of damage was quite extensive, repairs were carried out day and night in the hope to reopen the station for public use as soon as possible. MTRCL was aware that the public and students were very concerned about the time of reopening the station exits. Exit C1 was reopened on 24 December, and MTRCL was working hard with a view to reopening Exit A2 one week after the meeting. MTRCL also understood that the second semester of the University of Hong Kong would begin on 20 January, so it would inform the public on the latest information as soon as possible. Where feasible, MTRCL would reopen the exits expeditiously without delay. The current target was to reopen Exit A2 first because Exit A1 had sustained more serious damage.

165. The Vice-chairman invited further questions and views from Members. Ms NG Hoi-yan said that the MTR West Island Line was known as a "community railway" and MTR was widely supported by the public at that time. But now MTR gave no regard to the public and the community at all. She enquired whether MTRCL allowed anti-riot police officers to station inside MTR stations to wait for citizens in order to facilitate the rounding up of citizens. She also asked whether MTRCL allowed the Police to fire tear gas inside MTR stations.

166. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL responded that the enforcement work in railway areas had been handled by the Police since the MTR came into operation. As the operator of local railway networks, MTRCL would strive to maintain quality railway services. As for law enforcement, crime or law and order issues, all these had always been entrusted to the Police. MTRCL was not in a position to comment on the specific details of Police's law enforcement operations. He suggested that Members should check with the Police.

167. The Vice-chairman invited further questions and views from Members:

- (a) Mr NG Siu-hong said the Police had set up cordon lines at Central Station during a number of peaceful demonstrations and processions that took place near Central Station or outside Central. He also remarked that bus or minibus services to Admiralty/Mid-levels area would be cancelled whenever there were public processions, and residents of the Mid-levels area could only rely on MTR and the Central to Mid-level Escalator Link to get home. As Central Station was closed, residents had to walk home from Admiralty, and there were chances that they would be intercepted by police officers on the way home under such circumstances. He cited an example that his parents, in their sixties, were once questioned by police officers on their way home as to why they were on the pavement. When his parents told the police officers that they were on their way home, the police officers still intended to surround them. He believed that if his parents were young people, they would have been pressed onto the ground and searched by the police officers. He believed that this kind of situations would arouse public anger towards the Police and MTR. Mr NG also pointed out that MTRCL's share price in the past six months was reflective of the public's belief that there was injustice in its practice. He asked how MTRCL could give an account to its shareholders and whether it would continue to be controlled by and to complement the Police (i.e. letting anti-riot police officers to stop and search people inside MTR stations and blame those civilians who were filming nearby). Mr NG also questioned how MTRCL could live up to its capacity as an experienced railway operator.
- (b) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai said that MTRCL had ended daily service early over a period of time in the past. He understood that some stations which were seriously damaged had to be closed for repairs, but was puzzled why similar arrangement was also applied to stations with milder damage. He cited Kennedy Town Station as an example, remarking that only the glass at Exits A and C had been damaged from June till now. He could not see that these damages had a great impact on the operation of the whole station and running of trains which would necessitate the daily service to be ended early over a rather long period of time. He doubted whether MTRCL's policy was to complement a political task of the Government, that is, to create an impression that the

demonstrations had seriously affected the operations of the community. In addition, he could understand that the Police closed MTR stations during public order events in order to ensure the safety of the stations, but after the Police drove civilians out of the stations, the stations appeared to have become a mobile police station. He cited an example that many police officers were making operational deployment and taking a rest inside Causeway Bay Station after the station was cordoned off. He asked if MTRCL had given tacit approval to this, and if not, whether it would take action against the Police.

168. In response to Mr NG Siu-hong's comment, Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL said that MTRCL was aware of the impact of train service adjustment and station closure during this period of time on the public and wished to extend its most sincere apology. He said that MTRCL understood the impact on people's work and daily life, and was particularly grateful to passengers for their understanding. As for the decision to close MTR stations, he said that it was based on comprehensive consideration. MTRCL needed to assess individual stations, nearby stations, the entire railway network and social order in the community to ensure passenger safety. He emphasised that station closure or train service adjustment, which would affect the general public, was a last resort. But if a balance had to be struck between bringing convenience to the public and safeguarding public safety, MTRCL would choose safety as it was the company's primary consideration. In response to Mr LEUNG Fong-wai's comment, Mr HO said the reason that some stations were closed early or the stations of a particular railway line were closed early for a certain period of time was because the stations were extensively damaged between August and the end of 2019. Apart from some apparent damages, such as turnstiles, ticket machines, entrances/exits and lifts, etc., time was also needed to deal with some network facilities. If regular service hours for MTR was to be maintained, repairs could only be carried out during the few hours after train service ended after midnight, and there would not be enough time for MTRCL to deal with the damage done. Hence, it was necessary to end train service early in order to seize the time to resume normal operation of the stations as soon as possible. He reiterated that MTRCL was not in a position to comment on the details of Police's enforcement actions inside MTR stations.

169. The Vice-chairman said to Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL that Mr LEUNG Fong-wai's questions were whether MTRCL had a political mission and whether MTRCL's stance was to give tacit approval to Police's use of MTR as an operation base.

170. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL responded that the safety of staff, passengers and the railway system was the primary and sole consideration of MTRCL. He said that the Police maintained law and order and carried out law enforcement in railway premises



on their own accord.

171. The Vice-chairman asked whether MTRCL took orders from the Police.

172. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL responded that there was a clear division of labour and boundary, that is, MTRCL focused on maintaining a safe, reliable and efficient railway operation. Operations staff of MTRCL needed to take care of passengers and railway operation first no matter whether the stations were closed or still in operation. As for the specific work details of the Police, MTRCL was not in a position to comment.

173. The Vice-chairman invited further questions and views from Members:

- (a) Mr HO Chi-wang said that railway service suspension might be either ordered by the Government or arranged by MTRCL. He asked MTRCL's representatives that if this was not ordered by the Government, whether MTRCL would be penalised for ending train service early and station closures during regular service hours. In addition, he said MTRCL's representatives had pointed out just now that the Police sometimes needed to use MTR facilities, such as taking MTR to another destination. He asked whether the Police needed to pay fare under such circumstances, and whether they would be fined if they did not pay. He then enquired whether MTRCL had considered reopening the escalators at HKU Station in batches.
- (b) The Chairman pointed out that whenever Admiralty Station was closed, people living in South Horizons would have to take MTR to Ocean Park Station first, then take coach to Kennedy Town and change to other transportation to Admiralty. This would take them two hours to reach Admiralty. She asked whether the current arrangement could be adjusted, such as by changing trains in the Central and Western District. In addition, she received a complaint about the closure of Sai Ying Pun Station during demonstrations and trains not stopping at Kennedy Town Station. She hoped that there would not be such a "station-skipping" arrangement, and said that members of the public wished to return to a quiet life.

174. In response to Mr HO Chi-wang's views about Government orders, Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL reiterated that MTRCL would conduct risk assessment taking into account safety considerations in order to make an overall decision. The process also included communication with government departments, such as the TD and Police. And

the decisions for train service adjustment or station closure were made in light of the emergencies at the time. As for fines, under the Fare Adjustment Mechanism, MTRCL had been fined by the Government for train incidents in the past. As regards public assemblies in the past six months, MTRCL did not have information on fines for the time being. Regarding entry and exit of police officers to and from MTR stations, he said that if MTRCL needed to let passengers, regardless of their identity, enter the paid areas through the turnstile quickly in case of unforeseen events, particularly events that would jeopardise public safety, MTRCL would not ask them to pay the fare in cash immediately or require them to pay by Octopus card, and might even open the manually operated gates to let them leave as soon as possible. This had been the usual practice of MTRCL.

175. In response to Mr HO Chi-wang's views, Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL said that the damage to HKU Station was not limited to the lifts. For example, the glass canopies at Exits A1 and A2 were damaged, and more time was needed to replace the steel plates and safety fences at a height. These works were conducted to ensure safe entry and exit of passengers to and from the station, and the works progress would also affect the time for reopening of the station. He also said that originally MTRCL had arranged shuttle bus service between Ocean Park and Admiralty, but the service would not be available during public order events because MTRCL could not be sure whether or not the demonstrations would affect road safety conditions in the vicinity of Admiralty. Hence, MTRCL provided an alternative route to assist the public in accessing Island Line service to minimise the impact. This was adopted by MTRCL as a last resort in the absence of other alternatives. He said that MTRCL would seek to improve its service on a case-by-case basis in light of the situation and risks involved.

176. Mr HUI Chi-fung said that MTR was "CCMTR" and "Communist Party's Railway" not only in name but also in fact, because there were complaints that many residents, including his wife, could not find transportation home after MTRCL closed Kennedy Town Station. He remarked that MTRCL closed Admiralty Station at short notice on several occasions and even closed Wan Chai Station on 1 July. He asked whether MTRCL was here to serve local residents or the regime, as such acts had aroused public suspicion. So he fully understood if members of the public hate or boycott MTR, and said he was also one of them. Also, regarding the use of MTR trains to pick up police officers and MTRCL's manpower deployment according to police orders, Mr HUI asked whether it was stated in the MTR Ordinance, MTRCL's requirements and MTR Bylaw that such orders must be obeyed. He also asked whether it was expressly stated that non-compliance with these orders was an offence, or MTRCL was simply willing to obey all these orders. He further asked if MTRCL had ever refused to complement Police's actions in the past, such as Police's request to use MTR stations, close stations or entrances/exits, and bypass a particular station.

177. In response to Mr HUI Chi-fung's views, Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL said that passenger safety was MTRCL's primary consideration. Apart from any particular station, MTRCL also needed to take care of stations of other railway lines in similar situations. In case stations were damaged, especially in situations where safety was severely threatened, MTRCL would call the Police. He also said that he had no information on whether MTRCL had refused to complement Police's actions in the past.

178. Mr HUI Chi-fung said that if MTRCL wished to show the public that it was not serving politics, it could refer to the measure it adopted whenever MTR station facilities were damaged, that is, covering the damaged facilities with large plastic bags, with a notice printed in large fonts stuck on it saying that the facilities were vandalised and out of service pending repairs. It followed that when the Police requested the closure of a station, MTRCL could also put up a large board informing the public that the station was closed upon Police's instruction. Such a public relations tactic could show the public the political stance of MTRCL. He reckoned that people's impression on MTRCL was that it had been "communized" and had become the "Communist Party's Railway/CCMTR".

179. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that as a considerable number of Sheung Wan residents considered that MTR had been reduced to the "Communist Party's Railway" and they chose to travel by bus instead, the patronage of MTR should be lower. Also, he emphasised that Kennedy Town was not a major location for demonstrations and the extent of damage in Kennedy Town Station was insignificant, so he strongly hoped that MTRCL would not close the station. Mr KAM also quoted from the written reply that the TD had repaired all traffic lights properly, but this was not the case. For example, the traffic light at 367 Queen's Road Central in Sheung Wan was damaged months ago and had yet to be repaired. So he asked the Secretary to put this on record and inform the TD that its written reply was inaccurate and inconsistent with the fact. In addition, remarking that the HyD and EPD had decided right from the start not to send representatives to attend the meeting, he opined that the new term Council should not allow similar situations to happen. He believed that should Members raise any questions, the relevant government department should send representative to attend the meeting to answer questions. Mr KAM said he would like to propose amendments to the motions to be moved afterwards in order to condemn the relevant government departments.

180. The Vice-chairman suggested that those Members who were also LegCo members should consider putting the matters raised at this meeting to the LegCo for discussion.

181. Mr PANG Ka-ho relayed a complaint from local residents about the noise and exhaust gas problems caused by the shuttle bus service between Ocean Park and Kennedy Town stations. He opined that residents in the vicinity of Kennedy Town Station would not be affected by such nuisances if MTRCL had not closed Admiralty Station. In addition, with regard to Mr LEUNG Fong-wai's enquiry about the reason for closing Kennedy Town Station, the reply given by MTRCL's representatives was that the decision was based on a basket of factors and other elements, including the community and social atmosphere, also needed to be considered. Mr PANG said that even on the working days in last July and August on which no demonstration took place, Kennedy Town Station was still closed early at 10:00 pm. Given that no demonstration had taken place on those days, he enquired with MTRCL about the reason for closure of the station, for he did not understand why reinstatement works, if deemed necessary by MTRCL, could not be carried out at midnight. On the contrary, if it was due to the presence of imminent danger, then MTRCL should also close the station during daytime. He therefore would like to know about the reason for the closure of Kennedy Town Station. In addition, Mr PANG said that as a student of the University of Hong Kong, he was particularly dissatisfied with the management of HKU Station. He pointed out that MTRCL and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department were responsible for the operation of the two escalators at Exit C1 of HKU Station. He queried why these facilities broke down frequently and hoped MTRCL would explain the difficulties encountered by it in this respect.

182. Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL said that he had heard the views of Members on Kennedy Town Station and understood residents' feelings. MTRCL would take note of the relevant views. As for the noise problem caused by the shuttle bus service, he said that MTRCL hoped to assist as far as possible passengers affected by the closure of Admiralty Station after a risk assessment. MTRCL had also listened to Members' views. Mr WONG said that for the two escalators at Exit C1 of HKU Station, they were operated by the Government instead of MTRCL. MTRCL had also received views from residents and students, and had alerted the Government on those views. As MTRCL was not responsible for the maintenance of the facilities, it could only relay the views received to the Government for follow-up.

183. The Vice-chairman requested a response from MTRCL on Mr PANG Ka-ho's enquiry.

184. Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL said that according to his records, Kennedy Town Station had not closed early between July and August last year. And as far as he could recall, after a public procession took place in late July last year, MTRCL had suspended the train service between Sai Ying Pun Station and Kennedy Town Station with trains

terminated at Sheung Wan Station. Other occasions of early closure of Kennedy Town Station took place between last October and November.

185. Mr YOUNG Chit-on first declared that he held MTRCL shares. He said that different scales of demonstrations, vandalism and law enforcement actions involving the use of force had taken place in various parts of Hong Kong over the past few months, which had also caused considerable damage to MTR stations and railways. For example, emergency doors in some train compartments were operated. He enquired with MTRCL about the follow-up work in this respect. Although he was the District Councillor of the Peak Constituency and there was no MTR station in his constituency, he as a citizen also hoped that MTRCL would explain whether it had performed its duty to allay the worries of passengers about unexpected events. He hoped that MTRCL could explain how to restore confidence of passengers that there would not be a group of anti-riot police officers rushing in when riding on the MTR or sudden suspension of train services. Mr YOUNG pointed out that MTR was the lifeline of Hong Kong, providing services to over five million daily passenger journeys. MTRCL had the responsibility to maintain service provision at the time when political condition remained challenging. For example, it should explain to the public why stations had to be closed. He also pointed out that MTRCL should catch those who jumped over turnstiles, and was concerned that the problem would generate broken windows effect.

186. In response to Mr YOUNG Chit-on's views, Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL said that there were two phases of the situation. According to MTRCL's records, between last June and July, there were incidents of passengers preventing train doors from opening and closing, and later there were even people lowering the emergency doors located at each end of the trains. These incidents had greatly affected MTR train service operation. Service of several MTR railway lines were even suspended on certain days due to the widespread occurrence of similar incidents. Subsequently, extensive damage was done to MTR station facilities by some people, and MTRCL could only report the emergencies or vandalistic acts to the Police expeditiously for investigation and follow-up. Besides, in light of the incidents occurred in MTR stations in the past few months, MTRCL had deployed more manpower and hired additional security personnel, on the one hand to maintain the daily operation of stations as far as possible, on the other hand, to prevent emergencies from occurring and coordinate contingency response. Regarding the issue of jumping over turnstiles, Mr HO said that additional staff had been deployed to enforce the bylaws, and MTRCL had all along not encouraged nor wished to see people jumping over turnstiles. But if such a situation occurred, MTR staff responsible for enforcing the bylaws would try their best to handle the case in the light of the prevailing situation at scene. He emphasised that MTRCL hoped to maintain normal railway operation on different fronts and continue to provide safe services.

187. Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL added that on the days when members of the public launched non-cooperative movement, MTRCL had reported to the Police every case where the emergency door at each end of the trains was lowered. On the other hand, MTRCL had arranged security personnel to perform duties at all stations. Among them, in addition to locals, ex-Gurkha soldiers were also hired as security personnel. Apart from preventing the occurrence of relevant incidents, their responsibilities also included making passengers more at ease. MTRCL hoped that the public would feel safe and at ease when using MTR services. As mentioned by Mr HO Wing-hong just now, MTRCL had specially arranged a team to deal with the issue of jumping over turnstiles. It hoped that members of the public would travel on MTR trains according to the bylaws as this would be fair to other passengers.

188. The Vice-chairman pointed out that many people were concerned about the installation of metal platform screen doors at Mong Kok Station. He enquired about the reason for such practice, and whether this was a permanent or temporary measure, and whether metal platform screen doors would be installed at other stations. In addition, the Vice-chairman said many people had expressed concern about the presence of a large number of police officers, who were not in uniforms, inside MTR stations after the stations were closed. Some of them were even in plain clothes, clad in black and masked. Members of the public were also concerned about whether the incidents of vandalism of station facilities were done by undercover police officers. He therefore would like to enquire about the situation.

189. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that the Vice-chairman should check with the Police as some of his questions involved details of Police's operations.

190. The Vice-chairman said that he was not enquiring about the details of Police's operations, instead he wished to understand MTRCL's stance. That is, what had happened at that time according to MTRCL's understanding, whether it was the request of the Police to enter the stations, or MTRCL had paid no regard at all to someone entering the stations; and why there were still a group of police officers inside the stations after the stations were closed. The Vice-chairman pointed out that MTRCL, as the station management, should know what had happened and should not allow a group of masked people clad in black to stay inside the stations after the stations were closed. He hoped that MTRCL's representatives would not shirk their responsibilities. He reiterated that instead of enquiring about the Police's operational details, he just wanted to know whether MTRCL understood what had happened.

191. In response to the Vice-chairman's questions concerning specific days or

incidents, Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL said that he had no information on why there were still police officers inside MTR stations after the stations were closed. MTRCL was also not in a position to comment on the details of Police's operations.

192. The Vice-chairman asked that even if MTRCL did not have information on individual incidents, whether it knew that there were still plainclothes police officers staying inside MTR stations and taking action after the stations were closed. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that over the past period of time, there were often police officers inside MTR stations after the stations were closed.

193. The Vice-chairman said that those plainclothes personnel, wearing masks and carrying canisters of pepper spray, admitted that they were police officers. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that he would not comment on those police officers.

194. The Vice-chairman said that instead of asking MTRCL's representatives to comment, he just wanted an answer as to whether the practice of those people were allowed at that time. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that having regard to specific circumstances, for example, when station facilities were vandalised, MTRCL would report to the Police and wait for the Police to arrive to handle the incident. Also, when a serious emergency occurred, the Police would carry out law enforcement operations within the area of MTR stations. It was difficult for MTRCL to comment on the Police's practice.

195. Regarding the question raised by the Vice-chairman about Mong Kok Station, Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL said that apart from Mong Kok Station, the glass panels of platform screen doors in several other stations had also been maliciously damaged. As MTRCL did not have adequate backup glass panels for replacement, it could only use metal plates as alternative to ensure safety. The measure was only temporary and MTRCL would not replace all glass panels with metal plates. The metal plates would be replaced at a later time when backup glass panels were available.

196. Mr YIP Kam-lung considered that MTRCL's representatives had not answered the very first question he asked, that is, members of the public would not hate MTRCL without a reason. He also pointed out that initially MTR was very much cherished by Hong Kong people. But later they hated MTR a lot and criticised it out of their love for it. And MTRCL's representatives described the incidents as "vandalism" and "criminal damage" during the one-odd hour of discussion at the meeting. He also pointed out that there were photos showing that the broken glass of the platform screen doors at Mong Kok Station was not scattered towards the rail track but towards the platform. If someone damaged the platform screen doors on the platform, the broken glass should not be

scattered all over the platform, but should instead be scattered towards the rail track. Mr YIP doubted whether it was MTRCL's contractor, or the so-called rioters or police officers who broke the glass panels. MTRCL should make public the relevant CCTV footage to remove doubts. He also said that MTRCL had been nicknamed the "Communist Party's Railway" because it had yet to release the CCTV footage about the "831" incident. Mr YIP pointed out that there was a "Lennon Wall" off Entrance/Exit B2 of HKU Station on Hill Road. Many residents claimed that there was once a large group of police officers suddenly appeared at the scene after MTRCL staff or ex-Gurkha security personnel called the Police. He enquired with MTRCL whether it had reported to the Police regarding the posting of publicity materials by some people on the "Lennon Wall" located outside the MTR station footprint on Hill Road, claiming that a criminal damage had occurred. Mr YIP said that as far as he understood, no one had broken the glass panels at Entrance/Exit B2 of HKU Station initially. It was only after the Police arrested the persons who posted publicity materials that the glass panels were broken by someone subsequently. In light of this, he enquired whether MTRCL would call the Police regarding the posting of publicity materials outside MTR station footprint to request for prompt removal of the publicity materials and arrest of the relevant persons within the same day.

197. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that regarding the release of the CCTV footage of the "831" incident at Prince Edward Station, MTRCL had, in light of public concern, released screenshots captured from the relevant CCTV footage with time records in early September to facilitate a better understanding of the incident by the public. MTRCL had established procedures for handling the use of CCTV footage, and the Police had also conducted investigation after the incident. Since MTRCL had subsequently received a search warrant from the Police, the relevant CCTV footage had been handed over to the Police for further follow-up. As the Police was conducting an investigation and relevant court proceedings were underway, MTRCL could not disclose the CCTV footage of the "831" incident to persons other than the authorized persons. Should the Police and the court further clarify the "831" incident afterwards, MTRCL could examine possible follow-up work.

198. In response to the question whether MTRCL had reported to the Police regarding the "Lennon Wall" on Hill Road, Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL said that it had been the usual practice of MTRCL to clear the publicity materials in the areas within its purview. The "Lennon Wall" off Entrance/Exit B2 of HKU Station on Hill Road was outside the purview of MTRCL, so it was not under MTRCL's management.

199. Mr YIP Kam-lung requested MTRCL's representatives to clarify whether MTRCL had called the Police regarding the Hill Road "Lennon Wall" incident.



200. Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL reiterated that the location concerned was not under MTRCL's management.

201. The Vice-chairman said that he was also at the scene on the day of the incident and saw that there were only a few school girls posting publicity materials on the wall, but later 10-odd anti-riot police officers suddenly appeared at the scene. He considered this a waste of Police manpower, and Members only wanted to know whether MTRCL had ever called the Police for this.

202. Mr HO Chi-wang said that according to Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL, MTRCL did not call the Police. He then asked if any MTRCL staff had called the Police without Mr WONG knowing it, and whether Mr WONG had enquired with all relevant staff to ascertain that no one had reported the incident to the Police.

203. Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL said that some staff members were aware of the clearance of the "Lennon Wall", and some staff members had told him that the location was not under MTRCL's management, so MTRCL did not report the incident to the Police.

204. Mr YIP Kam-lung added that MTRCL had only released screenshots of the CCTV footage about the "831" incident, but many people demanded MTRCL to release the CCTV footage of Prince Edward Station of that day in full. He pointed out that some reporters had captured clear footage of police officers storming into the train compartments and beating up civilians wantonly. After that, not only did the Police refuse to allow reporters' entry into the station, but they had also committed many inhumane acts. That was why the public and the Council demanded MTRCL to release the CCTV footage in full. As regards the damage of the platform screen doors at Mong Kok Station, there were no protesters but only police officers present at the scene at the time of the incident. He therefore requested MTRCL to release the relevant footage in full. If MTRCL did not release the footage at today's meeting, he hoped that a request could be made in the name of C&WDC for MTRCL to release all relevant CCTV footage. And if MTRCL reckoned that the relevant footage involved personal data, he suggested that the matter could be discussed in closed session.

205. Mr NG Siu-hong remarked that MTRCL had said that closure of stations due to safety considerations was in accordance with the instructions of the Police and the Government. He queried that this would give rise to public relations issues, which would arouse public anger and undermine MTRCL's public image, resulting in more protest actions against MTRCL. He asked MTRCL's representatives how MTRCL could give an account to its shareholders.

206. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that it was the usual practice of MTRCL to handle emergencies by making a comprehensive decision in the light of the prevailing situation at scene with safety as the priority. He appealed to passengers for their understanding of the inconvenience caused by decision on station closures. He also said that the Police was investigating the “831” incident and relevant court proceedings were underway. Due to legal consideration, at this stage, MTRCL could only provide the CCTV footage to authorized persons and organisations in accordance with procedures. Mr HO added that for the “831” incident or any special events that occurred in MTR stations on other days, the relevant CCTV footage would be kept by MTRCL for a longer period. Generally speaking, MTRCL would only keep CCTV footage for 28 days, but the CCTV footage of the “831” incident or other special events that occurred in MTR stations would be kept for three years. He emphasised that for the sake of investigation, the CCTV footage of the “831” incident would be kept for three years.

207. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked whether the CCTV footage about the damage of the platform screen doors at Mong Kok Station would be kept for 28 days or three years.

208. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that he could not give a reply at this stage as he needed to review the records for incident occurred on a particular day. Mr YIP Kam-lung and the Vice-chairman suggested that MTRCL should provide relevant information after the meeting.

209. Mr NG Siu-hong said that the closure of MTR stations had tarnished MTRCL’s image, and asked MTRCL’s representatives how MTRCL could give an account to its shareholders. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that he understood the concerns of shareholders and passengers, and appealed to them for their understanding of MTRCL’s approach and decision under the relevant circumstances.

210. The Vice-chairman quoted the reply from MTRCL’s representatives that the CCTV footage of the “831” incident could only be provided to authorized persons due to legal consideration. He asked what legal consideration was referred to. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that MTRCL provided the CCTV footage of the “831” incident to the Police in accordance with the search warrant issued by the Police.

211. The Vice-chairman enquired about the legal consideration that prohibited MTRCL from providing the footage to other persons, as the court did not prohibit MTRCL from providing the footage to other persons, it only required MTRCL to provide the footage to authorized persons. MTRCL definitely had the right to provide the footage, which was its property, to other persons if it was willing to give an account to the public.

212. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that legally speaking, as the Police was conducting an investigation into the incident and relevant court proceedings were underway, releasing the footage might affect the investigation or court proceedings. As such, the footage would be retained, but not made public, until the relevant investigation or court proceedings were completed.

213. The Vice-chairman queried the remarks made by MTRCL's representatives, and said that not making public the footage would pervert the course of justice. What the court needed was truth, and what the CCTV captured were facts. The court could make its judgement. Hence, he could not see why MTRCL refused to release the footage.

214. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL replied that MTRCL understood the public's concern. However, as he said just now, if the court wished to find out the truth from the CCTV footage and make relevant legal requirement, MTRCL would assist in investigation.

215. The Vice-chairman reiterated that he was not talking about what the court or Police needed, but the public's demand for releasing the footage. He queried about the legal basis for MTRCL's practice. Given that what the footage captured were facts, he asked if there was any legislation prohibiting MTRCL from disclosing its property to the public and about the impact on court proceedings.

216. In response, Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL hoped the Vice-chairman would understand that as legal proceedings and Police investigation were underway, MTRCL could only release the footage in accordance with the requirement in the established legal procedures, and could not release the CCTV footage in full to other persons at this stage.

217. The Vice-chairman said he did not see any reason why MTRCL could not make public the footage if it was willing to do so. It seemed that MTRCL had fully complemented Police actions and would provide whatever information required by the Police in order to assist the Police in instituting prosecutions. But it would not disclose the truth that the public wanted to know. He reiterated that he did not see any laws preventing MTRCL from doing so, and the court had not issued any injunction prohibiting MTRCL from releasing the footage to other persons. Mr HO Wing-hong of MTRCL said that he had heard the Vice-chairman's views and had nothing to add in this respect.

218. The Vice-chairman said that the meeting would now proceed to deal with the proposal made by Mr YIP Kam-lung earlier that a request be made in the name of C&WDC, requesting MTRCL to release the CCTV footage.

219. Mr YIP Kam-lung clarified that as what happened in Prince Edward Station during the “831” incident might involve residents of the Central and Western District, he therefore suggested requesting MTRCL to provide C&WDC with the CCTV footage of all paid areas and non-paid areas of Prince Edward Station for study and review. If there were privacy considerations, MTRCL could propose to C&WDC whether the footage should be made available to the public, and C&WDC could also consider handling the matter in closed meeting.

220. The Vice-chairman said that he did not see any privacy considerations on the part of MTRCL because CCTV should not collect detailed personal data, and should only record for the sake of public order and safety.

221. The Vice-chairman asked Members whether they agreed with Mr YIP Kam-lung's proposal. Members present unanimously endorsed the proposal. The Vice-chairman declared that a request would be made to MTRCL in the name of C&WDC for releasing the CCTV footage of the "831" incident in full.

222. Miss YAM Ka-yi queried that while MTRCL’s representatives just kept mentioning about the damage at today’s meeting, the meeting should in fact focus on MTRCL’s maintenance responsibility and how to maintain normal operation. She also pointed out that the entrances/exits of HKU Station had been closed since 11 November last year. She asked when MTRCL commenced the repair works, and whether there was any delay in the repair works that caused inconvenience to the public.

223. Mr Rico WONG of MTRCL replied that MTRCL would not procrastinate the repair works. As far as he could recall, there were a few days where repair works could not be carried out due to safety reasons, and relevant work arrangements took time. Also, the site had suffered severe damage as it had been vandalised repeatedly, and the relevant repair works had been ongoing for some time.

224. The Vice-chairman proceeded to deal with the motions proposed in the paper. The following motions were adopted after voting.

- Motion:
- (1) The Central and Western District Council strongly opposes the use of tear gas by the Police against protesters and near residential buildings.
  - (2) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands the Police to maintain routine street level patrol by police officers.

- (3) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands government departments to step up street cleansing in areas where tear gas was launched, and cleanse those reachable surfaces of the external walls of buildings in these areas.
- (4) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands government departments to resume normal operation of community facilities.
- (5) The Central and Western District Council strongly opposes closure of stations and early suspension of MTR services by MTRCL when the stations have not been vandalised.
- (6) The Central and Western District Council strongly demands the Government to consult the Council and Council members of the affected constituencies before making changes to community facilities due to protests.
- (7) The Central and Western District Council strongly condemns the Environmental Protection Department and Highways Department for not attending the joint meeting of government departments convened by Council members to give an account of its work to the public and listen to public views. The Central and Western District Council strongly demands government departments to respect the Council and the work of Council members.

(Proposed by Mr KAM Nai-wai and seconded by Ms NG Hoi-yan)

Motions (1) to (7)

(14 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

225. Discussion on this item ended.

**Item 9: Oppose to the Proposed Eating Place at the Portion of Public Viewing Area and a Corridor adjacent to Shop L on Public Viewing Deck Level (2/F) of Central Pier No.7 (Star Ferry) (Application No. A/H24/25)  
(C&W DC Paper No. 24/2020)**

---

(7:47 pm – 7:48 pm)

226. The Chairman said she had received a written message from the planning consultant (Masterplan Limited (HK)) saying that it would postpone its planning application until two months later, to first address some technical problems and concerns brought forward by government departments. Hence, she suggested following the schedule of TPB and postponing the discussion of the paper. She said if C&WDC endorsed setting up a working group on town planning or on harbourfront, the issue could first be discussed in the working group, in order to minimise the time spent on discussing the issue in full Council meetings. She also suggested postponing the discussion of the motion put forward in the paper.

227. Mr HUI Chi-fung was in favor of the Chairman's arrangements. He said that he, as the mover who submitted the paper and the motion, expected that a record could be kept on C&WDC's overall stance: they disagreed with reducing public place and using the place for commercial purposes. He knew that Star Ferry also inclined to take a step back and look for a proposal acceptable to C&WDC. Hence, to save time, he agreed with not discussing the issue in the meeting.

**Item 10: Clarify the Land Use of and Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and Adjoining Area, and Turn Cadogan Street Temporary Garden into a Permanent Park  
(C&W DC Paper No. 23/2020)**

---

(7:48 pm – 8:12 pm)

228. The Chairman first welcomed the representatives of Wisdom Regeneration and Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town to the meeting. She said Ms HO Alice, District Leisure Manager (Central and Western) of LCSD, had already left the meeting.

229. Mr KAM Nai-wai raised a point of order. He said given that Members of the new term were eager to speak, the meeting might go on even after midnight if it was continued to be conducted in the current fashion. Hence, he suggested that every Member stick to the meeting schedule. He pointed out that the Chairman or the Vice-chairman hosted the meetings differently when compared to the past. Previously, Members asked a round of questions and representatives of the departments answered

them. Members then asked a second round of questions. He opined that it was easier to manage time by adopting the practice. Mr KAM said he had no objection to holding the meeting till late night. However, he opined that given that many guests were expected to attend the meeting, it would be undesirable to keep them waiting. As the meeting had taken two to three hours more than scheduled, he suggested that on each issue, the Chairman invite three rounds of questions at most from Members.

230. The Chairman invited Mr WONG Hung-tak, representative of Wisdom Regeneration, to speak on the item. Mr WONG Hung-tak said Wisdom Regeneration was a local organisation established in February 2017 and its objective was to achieve sustainable development by promoting “green community”. According to the 2016 Population By-census, the monthly domestic household income in Central and Western District was among the top three in Hong Kong. Although residents in Central and Western District had limited living space, they had an abundance of daily necessities and their waste disposal rate was even one of the highest in Hong Kong. It was fair that they needed a Community Green Station (CGS) in the district to strengthen recycling support and district support. However, Central and Western CGS had been quietly objected by C&WDC of the previous term and he did not understand why. He opined that everyone was responsible for protecting the environment and local organisations took the initiative to do it if the Government did nothing. He pointed out that the lot near Cadogan Street Temporary Garden had been vacant for a long time and it was once where stalls of the Kennedy Town Wholesale Market located. Although the lot was some distance away from the residents, it was a more convenient option for providing support related to environmental protection at the district level and serving educational purposes, when compared to other CGSs’ locations. Therefore, the organisation contacted Very Hong Kong in June 2018 and through its vacant site activation programme, the organisation had applied to Lands Department (LandsD) and LCSD respectively for using the vacant government land. To ensure that the departments understood the specific uses of the location by the organisation, the organisation had emailed them and had organised a community activity on 28 April 2019. It had been two years since the organisation had submitted the application and the organisation had kept in touch with the departments by email throughout the period. However, LandsD had yet proceeded the application because the department said that the emails were not written in English and it was necessary to consult other government departments on account of some other reasons. LCSD also turned down the organisation’s application, saying that it was due to building safety and that the location the organisation applied for could only be used for storing LCSD’s resources temporarily.

231. The Chairman invited Mr CHEUNG Chiu-tun, representative of Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town, to speak on the item. Mr CHEUNG Chiu-tun said

the ground decontamination works in Cadogan Street Temporary Garden in Kennedy Town were expected based on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report published in 2015. However, the report had an incorrect assumption, assuming that the location of Cadogan Street Temporary Garden would be used for building residential units. The assumption contradicted the outcome of the discussion in TPB in 2017 and severely affected the details of the EIA. As the assumption of the EIA Report completely contradicted the decision made by TPB, he opined that the EIA Report published in 2015 was invalid. The department should conduct another EIA because the soil test data was collected 20 years ago and there had been a lot of changes since then. Mr CHEUNG knew that CEDD had recently conducted a tendering exercise again but it had not been discussed in C&WDC. The department had not conducted any consultation nor another EIA before the tendering exercise was conducted. He opined that the problem was grave. He worried that the decision would be final by the time CEDD completed the tendering exercise and C&WDC would then become a “rubber stamp”. He hoped that C&WDC could attach importance to the situation.

232. The Chairman learnt that the Secretary had invited CEDD to delegate representatives to the meeting but CEDD had not delegated any representative to the meeting. The Chairman invited Members to speak:

- (a) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said quite some Members had protested several times to retain Cadogan Street Temporary Garden and had spoken in the TPB meetings. In response to the speech given by the representative of the organisation, she suggested that government departments conduct another EIA before taking any action because the EIA concerned had been conducted long time ago. It was especially important to do so because the public was very concerned about the objects which were contaminated with the residue of tear gas being placed in Kennedy Town; the residents had lodged strong objections to it. She said she, as a DC member, would be blamed by the residents definitely if ground decontamination works were conducted and underground substances were excavated before the unknown underground chemical substances were identified. She also pointed out that Cadogan Street Temporary Garden had remained “temporary” for a very long time and the residents were used to using the temporary garden because open space was insufficient in the district. She opined that the department should rename the garden as Cadogan Street Permanent Garden and should carry out repairs and enhancement works for the facilities in the garden.



(b) Ms WONG Kin-ching expressed regret over CEDD not delegating representatives to the meeting. She opined that officials of CEDD should answer Members' questions about the tendering exercise conducted for the ground decontamination works. In addition to the outdated EIA Report, as mentioned by Mr CHEUNG Chiu-tun, Ms WONG also said that Cadogan Street Temporary Garden would be the location where ground decontamination works were conducted closest to a residential area in Hong Kong's history if ground decontamination works were to be conducted there, as there was only a narrow road between the residential area and the garden. She was very worried and expressed her concern over how many protective measures the Government would take when carrying out ground decontamination works. In addition, Ms WONG said that according to page 3 of Annex I of the discussion paper, the "single site, multiple use" model might be implemented to build an underground car park there. As deep excavation works needed to be conducted to build an underground car park, she was worried that the Government would use it as an excuse to carry out ground decontamination works. As the suggestion was purely hypothetical, the department had not held any consultation regarding it and she questioned why it was necessary to build an underground car park there. She also questioned whether the location was suitable because the traffic in Kennedy Town would be aggravated if an unsuitable location was selected to build a car park. The traffic problems could not be eased and a higher vehicular flow would be attracted instead. She requested that the department must hold public consultations and conduct more studies, before determining whether the land use there allowed the establishment of an underground car park.

(c) Mr YIP Kam-lung remarked that C&WDC of the previous term had discussed Cadogan Street Temporary Garden. He had yet been a DC member at that time but he had also protested together with other Members, and successfully retained the temporary garden. He did not expect that the Government would use an insidious way to achieve the disguised ignoble end, and would go back on its words. On one hand, the Government said the garden would be retained but on the other hand, ground decontamination works were carried out there. The Government assumed that it could do whatever it wanted because the location was still managed by Government Property Agency. He opined that the Government completely overlooked the strong

demands of the residents in the district and of the public in the nearby districts for the open space. He absolutely supported the request for designating Cadogan Street Temporary Garden as a permanent garden. As Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin had said, he had protested there and had made demands in TPB meetings, showing that residents in Central and Western District cared a lot about the land use there. If the Government continued to covet the location and use carrying out ground decontamination works as a pretext, it totally acted against public opinion. He knew that the Government wished to use the location for “Lantau Tomorrow” and so, he opined that the location should be designated as “public space” immediately on the plan.

(d) Mr KAM Nai-wai recalled that \$7 million had been spent on building the temporary garden back when there was still the former Urban Council. It was known that the garden was not for permanent use when funding was allocated at that time. He had also anticipated that the public would strongly object to demolishing the garden after they were used to using it. He agreed with the suggestion of designating the location as a permanent garden, as put forward by other Members in the meeting. He opined that the location, as a city lung, was very precious and could be where residents in Kennedy Town got fresh air. He recalled that “three evils”, including demolishing the incineration plant and abattoir, had been “eradicated” in Kennedy Town. At that time, the demolition works had caused contamination to a considerable degree and the problem of dioxins produced was serious. As toxicity of the soil there was high, the demolition works back then were large-scale. The works included, for example, covering the chimneys and setting up multiple survey marks. He added that C&WDC of the previous term had discussed conducting ground decontamination works there. However, given that the area of the location was vast, they opined that the works would severely affect the residents nearby no matter what protective measures were taken. The consequence would be dire if the department conducted ground decontamination works and built an underground car park there. He believed that designating the location as a permanent garden and leisure facility, and not carrying out large-scale ground decontamination works there would bring the greatest benefit to the residents. Hence, he supported the motion.

(e) Mr HUI Chi-fung condemned CEDD for not delegating

representatives to the meeting. He said the consolidated written reply involved many departments, including CEDD, EPD, HyD, TD, Planning Department and LCSD, but none of them had delegated representatives to the meeting. He opined that they should definitely be condemned. He suggested writing to CEDD in the name of C&WDC to point out that not delegating representatives to the meeting was dereliction of duty. He also opined that the whole process pertaining to ground decontamination works was a black-box operation. C&WDC had discussed the problem many times, and the public treasured the temporary garden a lot and cared about its future. However, the Government had neither consulted C&WDC nor engaged consultancy to conduct studies. The proposal to build a car park was unheard of; the whole thing was a black-box operation and was conducted without respecting C&WDC. Besides, he opined that it was a shame that the department had not disclosed the details of the consultancy document. Mr HUI pointed out that the actions taken by the Government at the moment might affect future land uses. If the Government bypassed C&WDC and proceeded the works, it could be regarded as procedural impropriety legally and any decision made might be subject to lawful sanctions. He requested the Government to stop before it was too late. The Government should make the consultancy agreements public as early as possible, disclose the ongoing procedures and the areas involved, and respect C&WDC's opinions. They should stop debating over the issue about the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden. C&WDC had clearly stated that the department needed not carry out ground decontamination works or conduct any underground works. The department should not change the land use again for, for example, building luxurious residential units and etc. The department should respect the consensus on conserving the garden, which was reached among Members and especially within C&WDC of the current term, rename the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden as Cadogan Street Permanent Garden, and make it available for the public.

233. The Chairman agreed to taking follow-up actions regarding Mr HUI Chi-fung's suggestion for C&WDC to write to Director of Civil Engineering and Development. The Chairman said that the item had entered the voting stage and she invited Members to vote on the following motions. The following motions were adopted after voting:

Motion: (1) Requesting the Government to rename the Cadogan Street

Temporary Garden as Cadogan Street Permanent Garden by deleting the word “Temporary” in order to set the record straight and comply with the decision made by the Town Planning Board.

- (2) Excising the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden from the decontamination area of the ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area in order to safeguard the continued use of this green public open space by the public, avoid unnecessary public expenditure, and maximise the effect of protecting residents’ health should ground decontamination works are to be carried out at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir nearby.
- (3) Requesting relevant government departments to consult the Central and Western District Council and local residents on the temporary use and design of a harbourfront site in Kennedy Town before the commencement of the project works to ensure that the relevant use and design are in line with local needs. Uses involving temporary and open-type refuse collection point or open storage should not be allowed as they are extremely unhygienic and will arouse concern on environmental pollution, and are not aesthetically pleasing either. Contaminants stored there, if any, must be capped and measures for monitoring the impact on water, land, air and environment must be in place.

(Proposed by Ms WONG Kin-ching and seconded by Mr HUI Chi-fung)

Motions (1) to (3)

(13 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

234. The Chairman ended the discussion on this item.

**Item 11: Government’s Sense of Epidemic Prevention is Weak and Citizens are being Neglected and Abandoned to their Own Fate. Request Stepping up Epidemic Prevention Work to Prevent Hong Kong from Becoming an Infected Area Again**  
**(C&W DC Paper No. 25/2020)**

---

(8:12 pm – 8:44 pm)

235. The Chairman said the government departments which were responsible for decision-making could not delegate representatives to the C&WDC meeting but they had submitted a written reply regarding the paper. She invited everyone to refer to the written reply. She said the discussion of the day mainly aimed to collect Members’ views; the Secretariat would put Members’ views on record and relay them to relevant departments for reference. The Chairman invited discussion on the item and Members’ views were as follows:

- (a) Miss YAM Ka-yi said that relevant departments should be condemned for not attending the meeting for this item. She opined that it was negligence of public interest. Although the departments had given a written reply to Members, the reply was officialese, saying that for example, health measures at ports, government venues and facilities had to be strengthened. She said it was a load of bullshit and the reply mentioned no specific measures at all. She asked in the paper questions including when had the government departments received the first notification, on which day had they received the information, what actions had the departments taken at that time and how much understanding on COVID-19 had Department of Health or Hospital Authority gained at the moment, etc. However, the departments had not given any reply. She said it was still unknown how COVID-19 was transmitted and it was very worrying. Mainland China had recorded its first death from the virus and the family of the deceased refused to have the autopsy performed. As the situation involved public interest, she opined that Hong Kong Government should put pressure on or communicate with Mainland Chinese Government, so that the latter would convince the family of the deceased to have the autopsy performed and could have the viral genes analysed accordingly.
- (b) Mr HO Chi-wang commented that the Government’s sense of epidemic prevention was a subject of criticism. He said the outbreak of SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome) was serious back then

and many healthcare workers, as well as members of the public, died as a result. The same situation might arise again but the Government had not urged the public to wear masks and wash hands frequently. In the past, the Government had made appeals but this time, it was very frustrating to see that the Government had not learnt from past experience at all to prevent the epidemic. He pointed out that in addition to the Government, the public should shoulder great responsibility too; the Government also had not provided adequate education on the epidemic. He said that on the day of the meeting, a one-year-old baby girl developed symptoms of pneumonia and it was within 14 days since she had returned from Wuhan. He had also read in other papers that a baby of a few months old had also developed symptoms after arriving Wuhan. The cases showed that the public's sense of epidemic prevention was very weak. He did not understand why and questioned why it was necessary to bring a one-year-old baby girl to Wuhan. He hoped that the Government could strengthen public education on the epidemic and said the public should cancel their trip to Wuhan if it was not necessary. He pointed out that Hong Kong Post had earlier suspended postal services to Wuhan. He opined that while mails were inanimate objects, humans were living creatures. However, travels were not regulated and an Outbound Travel Alert (OTA) had not been issued on Wuhan. He strongly condemned the departments, and requested them to issue OTAs and educate the public, etc., to prevent Hong Kong from becoming an infected area.

- (c) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai felt extremely disappointed that government officials did not attend the meeting and only submitted a very empty written reply which suggested no actual measures, in the face of such an urgent and livelihood-related issue. He said COVID-19 was closely related to the health of residents in Central and Western District. Since the day the Government had started to give updates on cases of infection daily, at least five cases related to Wuhan had occurred in Queen Mary Hospital. As Queen Mary Hospital was a public hospital frequented by residents in Central and Western District, Central and Western District would also be exposed to the epidemic. The Wuhan-related pneumonia or the virus might also spread in the community. However, he saw that the so-called publicity work done by the Government was related to “stop violence and curb disorder” or “say NO to VIOLENCE”; the Government had done no publicity work

on COVID-19 to enhance the public's sense of epidemic prevention, which concerned the public the most and was most related to the public's health. He hoped that C&WDC could write to the government departments to request them to strengthen their sense of preventing the Wuhan pneumonia of unknown cause and step up publicity work on the public's hygiene awareness.

- (d) Ms WONG Kin-ching remarked that Hong Kong did not know much about COVID-19. She believed that Mainland China had not disclosed much information about it either and so far, it was only known that it was contagious. If COVID-19 could be transmitted from person to person, she believed that the outbreak of the epidemic did not occur only in Wuhan in Mainland China. She said according to the experience gained during SARS, it was known that Mainland China's notification mechanism was strictly controlled and Hong Kong was very passive. She opined that if the Government did not take the initiative to communicate with Mainland China and make enquiries, and tackled the epidemic through political means, Hong Kong would have to bear the consequence when Mainland China did not notify Hong Kong. Besides, she said Express Rail Link trips to Wuhan and flights to Wuhan had yet been reduced or cancelled but some sources reported that domestic flights had all been cancelled in China. She said Mainland China had taken adequate preventive measures but Hong Kong's borders remained open. She was very worried that there would be waves of the epidemic and the second wave would severely affect the health of Hong Kong people, especially those living in Central and Western District. As patients suffered from communicable diseases would be sent to Princess Margaret Hospital or Queen Mary Hospital, the health of residents in Western District would be greatly affected. She requested the Government to disclose more information and exert pressure on Mainland China, so that more information about the epidemic could be made public.
- (e) Mr WONG Weng-chi said some residents had reflected to him one week before the meeting that public hospitals had not provided masks to the visitors and the situation was very serious. He said liquid soap and masks were provided at the entrance of the hospitals in the past but many residents had aired the same view one week before the meeting. Hence, he requested that public hospitals under Hospital Authority must provide masks and liquid soap. In addition, he asked whether

FEHD could provide masks and liquid soap on every floor in the markets. He opined that it was a measure which was specific and could be implemented promptly. If it was not implemented, the virus would soon be spread at locations such as markets at the community level. He said he knew that some residents had been infected in the locations mentioned and so, he hoped that it could be handled as early as possible. He also pointed out that masks had been out of stock in the community one week before the meeting. He was unsure if the supply had been restored. He requested the Government to take care of it.

- (f) Mr YIP Kam-lung said COVID-19 was the most absurd; the coronavirus was very “patriotic” and it completely adhered to “one country, two systems” when it spread only in Wuhan and Hong Kong. He expected that other cities must also be affected if there was a major outbreak because Wuhan was at the heart of the Express Rail Link network, which was based on the “Four Verticals and Four Horizontals” layout. He worried that large crowds of people would come and go because Lunar New Year Spring Festival was coming. He quoted a news article posted by Mr HO Chi-wang on a social network as an example and said a one-year-old boy had also been infected and had been hospitalised in Princess Margaret Hospital. He remarked that the incident showed that Hong Kong’s situation was precarious. He also opined that it should be put on record that various government departments had left the meeting as a result of the “coup of civil servants”. He hoped that Immigration Department, in addition to Department of Health, should also do relevant work well. He said some DCs had put forward an impromptu motion, requesting the Chief Executive to visit Wuhan to inspect the situation. However, she had delegated Under Secretary for Food and Health instead. Mr YIP did not know if the inspection had been effective but Professor YUEN Kwok-yung, microbiologist of the University of Hong Kong, pointed out that the outbreak of COVID-19 was severe and its severity was comparable to that of SARS. He opined that C&WDC should prepare for the epidemic prevention work in Hong Kong. He also suggested that Members could consider allocating funding for purchasing masks and giving the masks to Members’ ward offices for distribution when discussing how to use the remaining funding amounted to \$1.3 million. Furthermore, he requested government departments to request Chinese Government, through LOCPG and the



Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the State Council, to announce all confirmed cases of COVID-19 outside Wuhan.

236. The Chairman invited Members to vote on the motions. The following motions were adopted after voting.

- Motion:
- (1) Requesting relevant government departments to give an account of the details of the first notification received, including the time and content of the notification, and give an account of the prompt actions and measures taken by relevant departments, so as to let the public know whether there is any cover up of the epidemic or belated epidemic notification.
  - (2) Requesting all government departments, including but not limited to the Department of Health (DH), to enhance the existing notification mechanism by requiring all private hospitals and clinics to promptly report to DH if they come across probable cases for immediate follow-up action by DH.
  - (3) Requesting relevant government departments to step up quarantine of persons arriving from Wuhan at boundary control points as well as to trace and monitor suspected cases. The above measures should also be extended to cover all persons arriving from the Mainland if the epidemic has spread from Wuhan to other provinces.
  - (4) Requesting all government departments, including but not limited to the Department of Health and Hospital Authority, to step up community education on Wuhan viral pneumonia, and adopt necessary measures to raise public awareness in epidemic prevention and prevent an outbreak of the epidemic in Hong Kong.
  - (5) Requesting all government departments, including but not limited to the Department of Health and Hospital Authority, to enhance surveillance of probable cases and treat probable cases under isolation until confirmation of diagnosis, so as to prevent the community's exposure to the probable source of infection as well as avoid causing public panic and threatening the safety of society.
  - (6) Provision of a one-off allocation by the Central and Western District Council in response to the viral pneumonia outbreak in Wuhan for use in educating about epidemic prevention and hygiene in the community as well as distributing epidemic-prevention supplies such as masks, so as to instill a stronger

sense of crisis about the epidemic among the general public.

(Proposed by Miss YAM Ka-yi and seconded by Mr LEUNG Fong-wai)

Motions (1) to (6)

(12 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

[Mr KAM Nai-wai subsequently indicated support for motions (1) to (6).]

237. The Chairman said it was necessary to follow up Motion (6). She said every Member wore a mask during meetings when the outbreak of SARS occurred in 2003. At that time, C&WDC had also allocated funding for purchasing a certain number of masks and distributed the masks to the public. She invited Members to put forward suggestions regarding allocating funding for purchasing masks. She also asked the Secretariat to carry out a quotation exercise and draw up a budget, and submit them to C&WDC and Finance Committee (FC) for decision-making.

238. Mr HO Chi-wang suggested purchasing masks that were not made in China. He worried that masks made in China were contaminated. The Chairman was in favour of Mr HO Chi-wang's suggestion. She said she also saw panic buying of local masks when she was in Taiwan.

239. Mr WONG Weng-chi agreed with allocating funding for purchasing masks. He also hoped that masks could be purchased as early as possible.

240. The Chairman commented that the situation was really serious if even hospitals could not provide masks. She said she saw in Princess Margaret Hospital that masks were still provided to the public.

241. Miss YAM Ka-yi suggested purchasing masks that were individually packed. Non-individually-packed masks would become a waste if the public did not use them

immediately. Besides, she said surgical masks used for medical purposes, instead of masks which had a relatively lower protection level like activated carbon masks, should be purchased.

242. The Chairman said activated carbon masks or cloth masks should not be purchased. She also asked whether it was necessary to purchase N95 respirators.

243. Miss YAM Ka-yi said N95 respirators was not the best choice because the public had to receive a training to learn how to wear a N95 respirator properly. Besides, the public had to undergo a test which took around 30 minutes to identify a suitable model. It was undesirable if a person wore the mask too tightly or incorrectly, and had to remove it to breathe well. Besides, a person would start to inhale carbon dioxide and suffer from headache and dizziness after donning a N95 respirator for a certain time. Surgical masks would be sufficient to protect against coronavirus similar to SARS.

244. Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with Miss YAM Ka-yi that N95 respirators was unsuitable because a test was required for its proper wearing and removal. He also agreed with Mr HO Chi-wang that masks made in China should definitely not be purchased. He remarked that “those made in China would explode” and it was not known if the production of medical masks in China followed the right direction. Furthermore, he opined that in addition to distributing masks that were individually packed, it was also necessary to post notices or hang banners in the name of C&WDC, to remind the public to be aware of the epidemic. He believed that C&WDO had spare locations for hanging banners too. He suggested that C&WDC provide epidemic-prevention kits to the public. He opined that many members of the public had already forgotten the lesson learnt from SARS in 2003. They opined that there was no virus under the great leadership of the Party. He opined that it was inconceivable and it was necessary to teach the public the correct ideas.

245. The Chairman asked whether alcohol-based handrub was conducive to preventing the epidemic. She said C&WDC could also refer to C&WDO’s previous practice of distributing alcohol-based handrub through District-led Actions Scheme, in addition to purchasing surgical masks that were individually packed.

246. Miss YAM Ka-yi said using alcohol-based handrub and washing hands brought about different effects. It was rather effective to use alcohol-based handrub when going out. Still, from a medical perspective, the most effective way was to follow the steps to wash hands because that was how germs could be completely killed. She opined that it would be good if C&WDC allocated funding for purchasing alcohol-based handrub because the public could still clean their hands when hand washing facilities were not available. The public would also be reminded to wash hands before and after wearing a

mask.

247. Ms YEUNG Wing-shan, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of C&WDO, said a subsequent agenda item was related to resource allocation and Members could discuss the budget under that item. She said the Secretariat needed specific information in order to conduct a quotation exercise, such as how many masks should be purchased, which type of masks should be purchased and how much was the budget. Besides, she said the Secretariat had collected the questionnaires on funding allocation from Members earlier. As mentioned in the previous meeting, since the nature of the suggestions received was different from that of the funded activities previously approved by Members, the Secretariat was consulting and seeking information from the headquarters. She said C&WDC could continue to discuss and pass the motion. After receiving a reply from the headquarters, the Secretariat would relay it to C&WDC where necessary.

248. The Chairman asked in view of the epidemic situation, whether one-off disposable products like masks could be purchased as long as Members passed the relevant motion. Ms YEUNG Wing-shan of C&WDO said that C&WDO would further study with the headquarters. As the issue was related to livelihood, C&WDC could first discuss it and approve the purchase.

249. The Chairman asked, in addition to distributing masks to residents through Members' ward offices, whether elderly units and kindergartens, etc. in the district also needed masks.

250. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked how many masks could be purchased with \$1.3 million. The Chairman said she was not sure and she asked whether the remaining balance of funds that could be used was \$1.3 million. Ms YEUNG Wing-shan of C&WDO responded that the remaining balance of funds of no more than \$1.3 million could be used.

251. Mr YIP Kam-lung further asked how many masks could be purchased with \$500 000. Assuming that each mask cost \$1, then 500 000 masks could be purchased. He said 50 Vietnam-made masks cost around \$30. He asked the Secretariat to conduct a quotation exercise.

252. Ms YEUNG Wing-shan of C&WDO said the Secretariat could conduct a quotation exercise. However, she suggested that C&WDC set out some guidelines, such as the budget, the beneficiaries and the uses, etc., so that the Secretariat could prepare a fund application expeditiously for approval by C&WDC.

253. The Chairman said if funds amounted to \$1 million was available for use, it should not be all spent on purchasing masks. She suggested spending \$300 000 to \$500 000 on purchasing masks, and using the remaining funds on purchasing alcohol-based handrub and printing banners and leaflets, etc. However, she was also concerned about whether the public would read the information on the banners and leaflets in detail. Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with spending part of the funds on purchasing masks and he opined that banners and leaflets were effective. The Chairman said they could ask Department of Health for a certain amount of leaflets for distribution.

254. Mr PANG Ka-ho said purchasing an appropriate amount of masks was more important than giving consideration to the funding amount. The Chairman agreed with Mr PANG Ka-ho. She asked whether it was necessary to distribute relevant supplies to kindergartens, schools, elderly centres and non-governmental organisations in the district.

255. Mr LEUNG Fong-wai worried that there would be an excessive demand on masks. He opined that it was also necessary to distribute relevant supplies to kindergartens, primary schools and elderly centres, in addition to Members' ward offices. He remarked that it was unnecessary to keep a large stock at every place for the time being. He suggested that 1 000 masks be kept in each place, for example, such that the total amount would not be colossal and the funding would be manageable.

256. Mr KAM Nai-wai said they would anyhow give out all the masks no matter how many masks they successfully purchased in the end. He said he had recently received the red packet envelopes and 4 000 to 5 000 red packet envelopes could all be distributed within one week. Hence, he suggested providing around 5 000 masks to each Member and each unit. 15 Members would need 75 000 masks. In other words, 100 000 masks or fewer should be purchased. Besides, the funds could be spent on purchasing more masks and fewer bottles of handwash. Each Member could be given 1 000 bottles of handwash. That is, 20 000 bottles of handwash in total should be purchased so that 15 000 of them could be given to the 15 Members and the rest could be given to other units. Although he did not know how long the epidemic would last, he believed that the said amount of supplies could last for three months.

257. The Chairman said masks did not expire easily. She asked whether Members agreed with distributing supplies to kindergartens in the district and whether it was necessary to purchase masks deigned for babies.

258. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he did not object to providing masks to kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools. As babies and children had masks specifically

designed for them and only secondary school students used adult masks, he suggested deciding how many masks should be purchased based on the number of kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools in the district.

259. Mr YOUNG Chit-on said it would be good if suitable masks could be provided to children and if they could properly use the masks. However, he commented that it was quite difficult because children would usually pull down their masks. Therefore, he suggested that with limited resources and little time, adult masks should be bought first.

260. The Chairman commented that masks for adults could first be purchased and as suggested by Mr KAM Nai-wai, each Member's ward office would be given 5 000 masks. The masks would be distributed to the public and in total, 75 000 masks would be provided. The number of masks given to other units would be taken into consideration afterwards. She opined that C&WDC should distribute masks to elderly centres and suggested distributing masks to youth centres as well. She suggested conducting a quotation exercise based on a specific amount such as \$100 000 first.

261. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that according to his experience of purchasing related products in Taiwan, he estimated that masks that were individually packed cost \$1 each and so, \$100 000 was needed for 100 000 masks. He also estimated that each bottle of handwash cost \$3 to \$5 and around \$100 000 was needed for 20 000 bottles of handwash. It was preliminarily projected that \$200 000 was sufficient for purchasing relevant supplies and so, he suggested setting \$200 000 as the amount for the quotation exercise.

262. The Chairman suggested spending \$200 000 on purchasing relevant supplies in the first round because it was not known how the epidemic situation would develop and it might be necessary to further heighten the sense of epidemic prevention. She also asked whether it would be easier for the Secretariat to conduct a quotation exercise if the budget was set at \$300 000; and the budget needed not be spent entirely.

263. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that to be prudential, a funding allocation of \$200 000 was more appropriate.

264. The Chairman said that a funding of \$200 000 would be allocated for purchasing supplies in the first round. Depending on the epidemic situation, C&WDC would determine whether it was necessary to expedite the allocation process in the FC meeting and other meetings held one week later.

265. Mr HO Chi-wang agreed with a funding allocation of \$200 000 for purchasing supplies at this stage. He also suggested using the remaining funds for purchasing masks

for distribution by phases.

266. The Chairman said that for Motion (6), C&WDC preliminarily decided to allocate a funding of \$200 000 at maximum for purchasing masks and alcohol-based handrub. C&WDC would first distribute the supplies to Members' ward offices and then ask the Secretariat to explore whether elderly centres and non-governmental organisations needed the supplies.

267. The Chairman ended the discussion on this item.

### **Standing Item**

**Item 12(i):**

**Progress Report on Urban Renewal Authority's Projects in  
Central & Western District  
(C&W DC Paper No. 14/2020)**

**Progress Report on Urban Renewal Authority's Projects in  
Central & Western District —  
Resumption of land for implementation of development scheme  
C&W-005 by the Urban Renewal Authority at Sung Hing Lane/  
Kwai Heung Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong  
(C&W DC Paper No. 15/2020)**

---

(8:44 pm – 9:47 pm)

268. The Chairman said Urban Renewal Authority (URA) had submitted two papers in relation to the standing item "Progress report on Urban Renewal Authority's projects in Central and Western District". One paper was titled "Progress Report on Urban Renewal Authority's Projects in Central and Western District" and the other paper was titled "Resumption of Land for Implementation of Development Scheme C&W-005 by the Urban Renewal Authority at Sung Hing Lane/Kwai Heung Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong". C&WDC would first discuss the paper "Progress Report on Urban Renewal Authority's Projects in Central and Western District" (i.e. C&W DC Paper No. 14/2020). She welcomed representatives of URA and Central and Western Concern Group to the meeting and invited the representatives of URA to present the paper.

269. Mr Wilfred AU, Director (Planning and Design) of URA, reported on URA's projects in Central and Western District.

(a) H18 Peel Street/Graham Street Development Scheme: Foundation works

were currently being carried out within Site A and there would be a multi-purpose hall. Site B's Public Open Space (POS) which linked Graham Street and Peel Street had already been opened for public use. Site A and Site C also provided POS. Upon completion of the entire H18 scheme, POS of the three sites could be connected together and took up one-fifth of the total area of H18. It could also be connected to the adjacent Pak Tsz Lane Park. In order to further improve market vibrancy and the business environment, URA had launched a mobile application called "H18". In addition to learning about the history of Graham Market and anecdotes about the market and shop operators, the public could also contact shop operators and order ingredients using the application. Market activities would be held in late February and six local artists would present products which represented the market. It was hoped that Members could attend the opening ceremony of the activities. For Site C, strengthening works for the internal area of the conserved building at No. 120 Wellington Street was to be completed tentatively in the first quarter of 2020. Strengthening works for the preserved portion of Nos. 26A-C Graham Street had been completed. It was expected that the whole scheme could be completed in 2023-24.

- (b) Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane Development Scheme (C&W-006): URA said acquisition was progressing well and it was expected that the scheme would be completed in 2028-29. Under the scheme, facilities at Li Sing Street Playground, such as the park, the soccer pitch and the basketball court, would be reprovisioned and connectivity would be enhanced. C&WDC's suggestion of retaining the 5-a-side soccer pitch and basketball court had also been taken into consideration. In addition, C&WDC had suggested that URA should at the same time carry out enhancement works at the portion of Li Sing Street Playground located between Li Sing Street and Sutherland Street. URA planned to consult C&WDC about the proposal in March after discussing the suggestions with various departments. Then, URA would engage a consultancy to produce an overall design and consult C&WDC again regarding the design. The works would commence only after URA garnered the departments' requests. Besides, 120m<sup>2</sup> of internal floor area would be reserved for an Elderly Neighbourhood Centre.
- (c) Progress of Urban Renewal for H19 and its Vicinity: Urban renewal had been continuously implemented through community making. TPB would determine the use of the portion of the vacant land near Shing Wong Street



and Wa In Fong West in mid-2020. Owing to safety concerns, URA, at the present stage, would use the portion of the vacant land near Wa In Fong West for community farming - a community making trial scheme. Besides, URA had earlier borrowed the government land there till November 2020, to examine whether the metal scaffolding and the retaining wall on the two sides were safe and whether the land could be open. URA wished to open as much land as possible under a safe condition but it was found that the retaining wall had to be strengthened to ensure safety, and carrying out the works might reduce the area that could be open or affect the trees in the vicinity. URA had written to Buildings Department to explore the possibility of altering the metal scaffolding and reducing the area it took up under a safe condition and so, further studies were required. In addition, URA had carried out some activities on community making in the district in the past months. For instance, URA had invited Primary 5 and Primary 6 students in the district to participate in the beautification works at Shing Wong Street together with the artists in December 2019. The six units at Staunton Street which were owned by URA had been handed over to The Hong Kong Council of Social Service for social housing. Nine blocks of buildings under URA's ownership within the H19 Project, including Nos. 88-90 Staunton Street which had already been graded, would be rehabilitated. Designers were being recruited and the designers engaged would later consult the stakeholders about works on building rehabilitation and revitalisation.

(d) Central Market Revitalisation Initiatives: To rehabilitate the concrete of part of the 24-hour passageway on 2/F, a temporary diversion had been arranged. It was expected that an occupation permit could be obtained for Phase 1 works in the third quarter of 2020, which could be open for public use in the first quarter of 2021. URA had held a briefing session on the mode of operation of Central Market in the fourth quarter of 2019. It was expected that a tendering exercise for the operation of Central Market would be carried out in the first quarter of 2020 and the operator could be determined in the third quarter.

(e) Urban Renewal Initiatives of H6 CONET: Organisations could make applications and organise different types of free-of-charge activities in H6 CONET for public participation. The public could refer to the website of H6 CONET to know more about the upcoming activities. Regarding the beautification works for the external walls of the buildings surrounding H6 CONET, subsequent to the completion of Hing Lung Street's wall mural,

two other buildings would undergo wall beautification works. It was hoped that the concept of urban renewal could be extended from the interior to the exterior so that old buildings and new buildings could mingle together. Furthermore, a building near the entrance of H6 CONET at Tit Hong Lane had joined the “Pilot Scheme on Local Building Partnership for Community Making”. Under the pilot scheme, a designer commissioned by URA would work together with owners and tenants of the building on the proposed design. Once agreement had been reached by the building’s owners’ committee, a tender exercise for the building rehabilitation works could be carried out within 2020 and the design could then be implemented.

- (f) Western Market: LandsD was processing the application for extending land lease of the Western Market for two years.

270. The Chairman invited Ms Katty LAW, Convenor of Central and Western Concern Group, to speak.

271. Ms Katty LAW spoke on H19, a heritage preservation and revitalisation project which covered Shing Wong Street. She said much vacant space in the area, including Nos. 6-10 Shing Wong Street, was enclosed by wire fences by URA for a prolonged period of time. She opined that with some repair works, the area could be used as a community living room. She said the residents there hoped that URA could open the area and an organisation had also applied to the Government for using the vacant land as a community living room. However, the area was borrowed by URA for safety checks. She hoped that URA could undertake to open the public space at Nos. 6-10 Shing Wong Street. She said residents living in the area would be very willing to participate in the project and give opinions. She also hoped that Members could monitor the project as well so that the heritage preservation and revitalisation project, which had formerly been a redevelopment project, could be perfected. Besides, as H18 involved many conservation elements, she hoped that URA could enhance the transparency of the design. She opined that improving the transparency was conducive to an effective communication. She hoped that the developer could be invited to present the layout in C&WDC and explain especially how the character of heritage inside Site C could be shown.

272. The Chairman invited discussion on the paper. Members’ questions and comments were as follows:

- (a) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin asked who managed and operated community farming, what kind of activities would be held and what the expected outcome was. She said ventilation facilities such as air-conditioners had been installed on the originally enclosed side of Central Market but relevant

equipment was absent at the moment. She asked whether ventilation facilities would be installed to improve the ventilation.

- (b) Mr HUI Chi-fung said the H18 scheme involved a large construction site. He had received complaints from residents saying that the works had caused damages to and cracks in their homes and shops. They hoped that the contractor could carry out repair works promptly. He said that as shown in the layout, the wall of Central Market facing Queen's Road Central would be demolished. He anticipated that many members of the public would like to use that space and that space might become a spot for illegal refuse deposit. He asked how the space would be managed. He agreed with Ms Katty LAW and wished to follow up the progress of the conservation-related items under H18 and discuss it thoroughly. He hoped that a working group on historic town district could be set up under C&WDC of the new term. Conservation architects of the contractor could be invited then to attend the meetings of the working group and to present conservation proposals, so that transparency of the conservation work could be enhanced.
- (c) Mr KAM Nai-wai asked about the acquisition progress for In Ku Lane and the timetable for demolishing buildings and reprovisioning the park. He was dissatisfied that FEHD, without consulting C&WDC, spent around \$2 million on renovating the public toilets there. He asked why FEHD had to spend around \$2 million on the renovation works when the location was to be redeveloped soon. He said he would complain to Audit Commission. He was in favour of renovating the whole park and asked when a preliminary design would be available. He wished to consult Members and the Concern Group regarding the design. He also asked whether the units at No. 466 Queen's Road West had been rented to tenants from other districts such that residents in Central and Western District could not continue to use that location. He wanted to know about the latest situation on the usage of the units there. For Western Market, he asked whether the shop operators there had been updated with the latest development. Finally, he asked whether it was possible to set up an official "Community Lennon Wall" at Central Market or at locations under other schemes. He hoped that Central and Western District could have the first "Community Lennon Wall" set up jointly by DC and URA, so as to let the public express their views regardless of their political stance.
- (d) Ms NG Hoi-yan said she just knew that a community garden would be set

up under H19. She said she had been a C&WDC Member for quite some time and she had also attended district consultation activities. Yet, she had never heard that residents wished to have a community garden. She asked where the idea originated, whether the community garden would be open to residents in the district, and whether it would be managed by a specific non-governmental organisation. She asked whether it was possible not to set up a community garden but to instead open the location directly to the public. She also wished to know about the community's demand for a garden. Instead of setting up a community garden there, she suggested setting up a library managed by non-governmental organisation or placing bookshelves for bookcrossing. She said similar practices had also been adopted in foreign countries and she hoped that URA could study the suggestions.

- (e) Mr NG Siu-hong also said he had never heard of the community garden project under H19. He only knew that some community groups made suggestions on the community living room and he asked about its progress. He expressed concern over how the community garden would be operated and suggested that the community garden be managed and operated by non-governmental organisations, such as community centres, which Members found reliable. Besides, he hoped that H19 could be open to community groups for organising activities as early as possible. He asked whether the standard basketball court would be retained under the In Ku Lane development scheme and whether its area would be reduced. He said some basketball courts under LCSD were not up to standard. In addition, he pointed out that groundwater seepage was serious in Central Market and he had already reflected it to relevant staff. In addition to causing street obstruction, water seepage had also caused collapse there before. He asked whether URA had identified the source of seepage. He agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai that a "Community Lennon Wall" should be set up and he asked about URA's view on "Lennon Wall". He said the "Lennon Wall" in Central Market had not been cleared by staff and he hoped that it could be remained so, so that the public could freely express their opinions.
- (f) Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with setting up a "Lennon Wall". He said it could be named as "Community Democracy Wall" to be politically neutral. As long as personal attacks were not made, everyone was welcomed to voice opinions on the "Democracy Wall". Some other rules could also be established. He said URA was not a government department and should not be shackled like government departments were. If URA worried that

there would be inappropriate contents posted on the “Democracy Wall”, it could send staff to monitor the wall and remove the contents. He said he, as an Ani-Com & Games Hong Kong project consultant, had been consulted by URA staff regarding H6. He opined that URA had an open mind on the activities held in H6. He suggested that more different attempts, such as setting up a “Community Message Board”, could be made. Regarding the preservation projects, he hoped that URA could be more receptive to the comments of the residents in the district and draw on them. He did not accept that URA retained only the exterior of the tenement buildings and changed the interior to a shopping mall. He hoped that the conservation was about conserving history but not only about conserving the exterior.

- (g) Miss YAM Ka-yi hoped that URA could listen to the public more often regarding future projects and realise the concept of civic participation, with a view to understanding the residents’ needs. She agreed with Mr YIP Kam-lung and said it was not a must to name places for the public to voice opinions and collecting their views “Lennon Wall”, and this was a golden opportunity to garner public views. In addition, she hoped that URA could give Ms Katty LAW’s opinions sufficient consideration and provide more public space for public use. She said this was a global trend.

273. Mr Wilfred AU of URA responded to Members’ questions. Regarding Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin’s comments on the community garden, he said the stakeholders came up with setting up a community garden after discussion held in the consultation process of community making in 2019. They opined that in the community, a community living room could be built indoors and the outdoor space could be used for cultivation. URA planned to engage gardeners who were experienced in community planting to manage the garden for six months. During the period, URA wished to see who would be interested in joining and what activities would be held. Then, URA would openly call for suitable organisations to continue the operation. For Central Market, Mr AU said four air-conditioners had originally been installed there and some more air-conditioners had been installed. He remarked that the management company had not turned them on probably because of some concerns over environmental protection. URA would continue to follow up to improve the ventilation. He added that the footpath outside Central Market was managed by the Government, and URA was responsible for the renovation works of the building. The extended portion would also be temporarily managed by the Government and upon the completion of the renovation works, URA would re-provision the surface of the footpath and plant trees at Queen Victoria Street. It was expected that the environment would improve gradually. In response to Mr HUI Chi-fung’s question about the cracks that appeared in the residential flats and shops, Mr AU said the works department was following up the problem and if the problem persisted, URA could

be contacted for further follow-up actions. For the design of Site C under H18, URA was waiting for Buildings Department to approve the buildings plan and URA would later invite the developer to present the conservation design to C&WDC.

274. Mr Wilfred AU of URA responded to Mr KAM Nai-wai regarding the progress of Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane Development Scheme (C&W-006). He said the developer would take over the scheme and carry out works in around 2023-24; before that, URA would carry out preliminary re-provision works, including re-provisioning the basketball court. In March, URA would present to C&WDC the works conducted by URA, including enhancing the open space at Li Sing Street. URA would also engage designers to carry out detailed design work and consult users of the facilities and local organisations (elderly groups especially) during the process. It was expected that the works could commence by phases in 2021 after the design was submitted and approved by C&WDC in 2020. For the murals, Mr AU said the current theme was the history of the district. If a building lent out its exterior walls, its owners' corporation had the right to express its opinions. He continued that there was space for art exhibitions in H6 CONET. URA had to consider the feasibility if applications for exhibiting non-artwork in H6 CONET were received. He said an exhibition had been launched in the form of words and C&WDC could submit an application if it had any specific suggestion. Regarding Ms NG Hoi-yan's suggestion of setting up a library or placing bookshelves for bookcrossing under H19, Mr AU said URA had considered bookcrossing. As the ground floor area of the nine buildings there could be used for non-domestic purposes, the interior of the buildings could be used for bookcrossing, so that books needed not be placed outdoors and be affected by weather. URA would request the tenderers to organise bookcrossing activities when conducting a tender exercise to select the operator of the co-living space in future. As for the proposed community garden, URA would consider placing the plants cultivated by the residents at locations such as the staircase at Shing Wong Street and Wing Lee Street, with a view to improving the environment. He said URA put safety first whenever it considered whether a piece of land would be open. The same principle applied when URA considered whether the vacant land at Nos. 8-10 Shing Wong Street should be open. There was a retaining wall and it was believed that its situation was similar to that of the nearby retaining wall mentioned just then. Besides, the surface was still covered with indoor tiles and was not completely levelled. There was no usable barrier-free access either. Owing to various technical and safety considerations, URA opined that it was unsafe to and had no plan to open that piece of land.

275. Mr Wilfred AU of URA responded to Mr NG Siu-hong and said the area of the basketball court would not be reduced after re-provision. Regarding water seepage in Central Market, URA had known about the situation and had immediately taken follow-up actions. As for Miss YAM Ka-yi's suggestion of increasing community participation, Mr AU replied that URA had tried to increase community participation in the revitalisation projects through

community making in mid-2019. For the acquisition progress of Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane Development Scheme (C&W-006), Mr AU said over 90% of property interests had been acquired. He also hoped that C&WDC would support the proposal for land resumption related to Sung Hing Lane/Kwai Heung Street Development Project (C&W-005), to resume the remaining property titles which had not been acquired. For the handling of "Lennon Wall", Mr AU said URA would continue to keep an eye on the existing "Lennon Wall" in Central Market. This kind of "Lennon Wall" would not be cleared for the time being as long as it did not cause danger by, for example, blocking the signs for escape routes.

276. Ms Michelle TONG, Senior Manager (Acquisition and Clearance) of URA, responded to Mr KAM Nai-wai regarding the rehousing arrangements for the residents in Central and Western District. She said after assessing Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane Development Scheme and Sung Hing Lane/Kwai Heung Street Development Project, URA had to rehouse around eight households at No. 466 Queen's Road West. URA had reserved sufficient units for tenants affected and details could be submitted after the meeting.

277. The Chairman asked whether the shop operators in Western Market were aware that URA had submitted an extension application to LandsD for tenancy extension of Western Market for another two years. Mr Wilfred AU of URA said URA would notify the shop operators after LandsD processed the application.

278. The Chairman said that the other discussion paper titled "Resumption of Land for Implementation of Development Scheme C&W-005 by the Urban Renewal Authority at Sung Hing Lane/Kwai Heung Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong" was submitted by LandsD but no representative of LandsD attended the meeting. She welcomed the representatives of URA to the meeting and invited them to present the paper.

279. Ms Michelle TONG, Senior Manager (Acquisition and Clearance) of URA, reported on the acquisition progress. She said 100 property titles could be acquired in total under the whole scheme and 80% of the owners had accepted the acquisition offer. All owner-occupiers living on the upper floors and 16 ground floor shops had accepted the acquisition offer. 16 upper-floor resident units (either rented or vacant) and 4 ground floor shops did not accept the acquisition offer. The 20 property titles involved 22 tenants, 20 domestic tenants and 2 ground floor shop operators. URA wished to rehouse and compensate the 20 domestic tenants as early as possible. However, since the property titles had not been successfully acquired, URA still needed to wait for the owners to sell their properties to URA or for the Government to resume the land, before URA could deal with the issue.

280. The Chairman invited discussion on the paper. Members' questions and comments were as follows:

- (a) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin asked when URA planned to discuss the issue in the Executive Council and rehouse the tenants after discussion in the C&WDC meeting. LandsD had not delegated any representative to the meeting; she asked whether staff of LandsD had to be present in order for C&WDC to endorse the suggestions in the paper.
- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai said he did not support URA to forcefully acquire private buildings. He said private property rights was very important. Most of the urban renewal projects carried out in Hong Kong could generate profits but the profits would be in the hands of private developers. He commented that land revenue generated in future developments would not go to the owners affected if the mode of cooperation on development schemes between URA and private developers remained unchanged. He opined that it was an issue of principle and hence, he definitely did not support URA to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance to apply for the reversion of the properties that had yet been acquired. He hoped that URA would continue to negotiate with the owners who had not accepted the acquisition offer, in order to acquire the remaining property titles.
- (c) The Chairman said regarding the acquisition related to Sung Hing Lane, owner-occupiers and non-owner-occupiers were given different acquisition prices. The Chairman hoped that Members could, before making a decision, express their opinions on whether they supported URA to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance to apply for the reversion of the properties that had yet been acquired.

281. Ms Michelle TONG of URA responded to Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin and said URA planned to gazette the land resumption in the second quarter of 2020. The land would be reverted to the Government usually three months after it was published in the Gazette. The Government would make an offer of compensation to owners and occupants affected in around one month and URA would arrange balloting and rehousing after the owners and occupants accepted the offer. She said URA would not request the tenants affected or the owners to leave immediately once they received a standard letter for compensation; they would usually be given six to eight months to move out. Regarding owners whom URA could not reach agreement with, four property titles could not be acquired because of the inheritance issue and three property titles could not be acquired because the owners, for health reasons, could not sign any legal documents. Other owners who rented out their units did not accept the offer because they did not accept the price. URA would continue to discuss the compensation with them.



282. The Chairman sought Members' opinions on URA invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance.

283. The Vice-chairman said URA would invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance to resume the land and make an offer of compensation when agreement could not be reached. He asked URA what would be done if an owner refused to accept the offer of compensation. In addition, he learnt that proposals for land resumption made by URA only offered a compensation which equalled the value of the land and mentioned nothing about the relocation allowance. He asked whether owners could still be granted the relocation allowance even if they did not know how to apply for it. He also asked how URA determined the value of property titles and whether assessments would be made solely by the Government's Estate Surveyors or Rating and Valuation Department, or by multiple private surveyors. He remarked that although owners could make an appeal against the value assessed, the public might not have time or might not know how to do so. He asked how URA could prove that it handled the acquisition of each property title in a fair manner.

284. Mr KAM Nai-wai said he had voiced his opinions and he hoped that C&WDC saw eye to eye with him. He opined that Members should not assist URA in forcefully resuming the land when URA failed to make a fair offer and could not acquire the property titles. Elected by the public as DC members, he said Members should stand with the public and should not support the Government's land resumption proposal. He hoped that it was agreed by C&WDC as well.

285. Ms Sarah YUN, Senior Manager (Community Development) of URA, responded to Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin regarding whether staff of LandsD had to be present in the meeting in order for C&WDC to endorse the suggestions in the paper. She said that since the paper was submitted by LandsD and it did not delegate representatives to the meeting, and there was no precedent to make reference to, she had to further look into it.

286. Mr Wilfred AU of URA added that the paper mainly aimed to consult Members so Members, instead of LandsD, had a bigger role to play in the issue. The paper was discussed in the open meeting but still, it was up to LandsD to decide if it would accept the outcome of the discussion in the meeting.

287. Ms Sarah YUN of URA added that like what the Chairman had said, URA wished to know how Members saw the Lands Resumption Ordinance and consult them about it.

288. Ms Michelle TONG of URA responded to the Vice-chairman's questions. She said owners could submit an appeal to the Appeals Committee of LandsD or submit the claim

to the Lands Tribunal for a determination of the amount of the compensation if they did not accept the offer of compensation made by the Government. She said owners needed not apply for the relocation allowance themselves; URA would delegate professionals to the units concerned to measure the area occupied and would disburse allowance to the persons affected in accordance with the information. As for the professional expenses incurred in the course of land resumption, URA would distribute the guidelines published by LandsD during land resumption and details about claiming the fees could be found in the guidelines.

289. Mr YIP Kam-lung suggested discussing the paper in the following meeting because LandsD had not delegated representatives to the meeting.

290. The Vice-chairman suggested withdrawing the paper. He opined that it was disrespectful that LandsD, being the government department which submitted the paper, had not delegated representatives to the meeting. Members were not responsible for thinking or expressing opinions for LandsD. To preserve C&WDC's dignity and follow C&WDC's procedures, the paper should be withdrawn.

291. The Chairman said the paper was submitted by Urban Renewal Section of LandsD.

292. Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin was concerned about the rehousing arrangements for the tenants. She said URA had set a precedent in the building collapse incident in To Kwa Wan and the people had been rehoused before the land had been acquired. She asked whether URA could first rehouse the tenants if a paper had to be resubmitted for discussion.

293. Ms Michelle TONG of URA replied that the precedent had been set because of a special incident. At that time, URA had made conditional offers to the owners, and the arrangement could only be made if the owners had been under some special conditions.

294. The Chairman said that the paper was submitted by LandsD but LandsD had not delegated representatives to attend the meeting and consult Members. After listening to Members, the Chairman said C&WDC had previously objected to invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance to resume land. The Chairman suggested withdrawing the paper.

295. The Vice-chairman said withdrawing the paper meant that LandsD had to resubmit a paper to C&WDC for discussion. He reiterated that LandsD, being the government department which submitted the paper, was disrespectful to C&WDC for not attending the meeting, and Members could not raise questions as a result. Hence, Members had no responsibility to discuss the paper submitted by LandsD.

296. The Chairman remarked that the Lands Resumption Ordinance was an important

ordinance. She understood that the tenants there wished to be rehoused as early as possible but C&WDC could not force the owners to sell their properties against their will. It was also necessary to pay attention to the handling of the cases in which selling of the properties could not be made because of inheritance and health reasons.

297. The Vice-chairman suggested the Secretariat to put on record that C&WDC did not discuss and withdrew the paper because LandsD had not delegated representatives to the meeting.

298. The Chairman declared that the paper was withdrawn. She thanked URA for the information and opinions given. The Chairman instructed the Secretariat to ask LandsD to resubmit a paper to C&WDC for discussion.

**Item 12(ii):** { **Conserving Central**  
(C&W DC Paper No. 16/2020)  
  
**Arts Groups are Deeply Concerned about the Occupation by the Police of the Parade Ground on Christmas Eve due to Inadequate Space in the Report Room at Tai Kwun, Worrying that Police Officers would Cause Disturbance and Scare the Audience during the Event**  
(C&W DC Paper No. 28/2020)

---

(9:47 pm -10:27 pm)

299. The Chairman said the paper titled “Conserving Central” (C&W DC Paper No. 16/2020) and the discussion paper titled “Arts Groups are Deeply Concerned about the Police’s Occupation of the Parade Ground on Christmas Eve due to Inadequate Space in the Report Room at Tai Kwun, Worrying that Police Officers would Cause Disturbance and Scare the Audience during the Event” (i.e. C&W DC Paper No. 28/2020) would be discussed together. She said representatives of Development Bureau (DEVB) and HKPF, who were supposed to attend the meeting, had not come. She welcomed representatives of The Jockey Club CPS Limited (JCCPS), Central and Western Concern Group (CWCG) and Kei Yan Primary School Alumni Concern Group to the meeting.

300. The Chairman said Members could consider not discussing the paper submitted by DEVB (C&W DC Paper No.16/2020) because DEVB had not delegated representatives to the meeting. Members agreed not to discuss the paper.

301. Mr YIP Kam-lung suggested that the Chairman invite Reverend Peter Douglas KOON Ho-ming, representative of Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH), every time when

the item “Conserving Central” was discussed in C&WDC meetings. The Chairman agreed to the arrangement.

302. The Chairman invited Ms Katty LAW, convenor of CWCG, to speak. Ms Katty LAW expressed regret over the absence of government officials in the meeting and said she felt disrespected. She first spoke on the new planning for Bishop Hill and said TPB had lowered the building height restriction (BHR) there to 80 mPD, indirectly rejecting HKSKH’s proposal to build a private hospital of 135 mPD high there. Ms LAW said they had always suggested designating Bishop Hill and Government Hill as the first class protection area. She said Bishop’s House was only a Grade 1 historic building and had yet been listed as a declared monument. CWCG had to continue to strive for it. She believed that HKSKH should retain Hong Kong Central Hospital as the BHR was now lowered to 80 mPD. She opined that Hong Kong Central Hospital had a unique history, as well as social and architectural values. She also said that in the previous TPB meeting, both CWCG and Members suggested setting up a community medical clinic in the district to provide medical services to residents living in Central and Western District and people working in Central. She hoped that HKSKH would stop leaving the building idle and wasting community resources. She also pointed out that Alford House and Ridley House at Caine Road had been vacant for a few years. She opined that they were suitable for accommodation and such precious community resources had been wasted. In addition, she said there were over 10 000 people living in sub-divided units on Hong Kong Island and many people could not enjoy an ideal living environment. The proposed youth hostel next to Man Mo Temple had yet been completed and it was doubtful whether the foundation there had some problems. There were two residential buildings readily available in Central District but HKSKH, which was responsible for managing them, had not made any arrangement. She said that according to the land lease, the two buildings were for residential purposes and the Government was entitled to resume the land and use it in ways which benefitted the public or the society. Ms LAW suggested that HKSKH renovate the two buildings and use them as youth hostels as early as possible, with a view to providing hostel places in the short run and retaining the two buildings at the same time. She continued that the General Post Office (GPO) Building had been included in the list of “Heritage in Danger” by an international conservation body. Ms LAW hoped that C&WDC could promote conservation planning and strive for excision of the GPO Building from the boundary of the land sale area, in order to preserve the building for "Government, Institution or Community" use and make good use of it.

303. The Chairman invited Mr MAK Hin-shing, representative of Kei Yan Primary School Alumni Concern Group, to speak. Mr MAK Hin-shing said he had written to the Antiquities Advisory Board and asked the Board to change the grading of the Compound (which included religious and educational structures) at Bishop Hill on 18 October 2019. He said he attended the meeting because he wanted to discuss Hong Kong Central Hospital, which had

been overlooked. He pointed out that it had been 53 years since Hong Kong Central Hospital had been built but it had yet been graded. However, buildings similar to Hong Kong Central Hospital, such as Wan Chai Market, Bridges Street Market and Central Market, had all been graded as Grade 3 historic buildings. According to the information of Buildings Department, the layout of Hong Kong Central Hospital could be traced back to 27 August 1948 or before, and Hong Kong Central Hospital was built by an architect named Mr KUO Yuan-Hsi. The work of Mr KUO Yuan-Hsi included the Century of Progress International Exposition in Chicago and the cemetery which buried the New 1st Army in Guangzhou. He was hailed as one of the first-generation Chinese architects. Mr MAK hoped that Members could support and follow up the conduct of grading assessment for the Bishop Hill Compound. He also hoped that Members could promote Conserving Central, Government Hill and Bishop Hill to become the first World Heritage site of Hong Kong.

304. The Chairman said C&WDC would not discuss the paper titled “Conserving Central” and would only discuss the paper titled “Arts Groups are Deeply Concerned about the Police’s Occupation of the Parade Ground on Christmas Eve due to Inadequate Space in the Report Room at Tai Kwun, Worrying that Police Officers would Cause Disturbance and Scare the Audience during the Event”. The Chairman invited Ms Anita LO, Head of Facilities Management of JCCPS, to speak on the paper.

305. Ms Anita LO of JCCPS said she could reply firmly that no anti-riot police officers had entered the visiting area of Tai Kwun that day. The Police Service Centre in Tai Kwun had a separate entrance/exit and it was located next to Pottinger Gate at Hollywood Road. According to internal records, anti-riot police officers had entered and exited the Police Service Centre that day. However, they were performing their duties in the Police Service Centre and had not entered the area of Tai Kwun to perform any operation. Hence, the Jockey Club could give a definite reply that anti-riot police officers had only entered and exited the Police Service Centre and had not entered the area of Tai Kwun that day. She continued that Tai Kwun was a place which promoted conservation and culture and so, it would not become a base for other government departments. Besides, according to internal guidelines, security work in Tai Kwun was conducted by security guards engaged by Tai Kwun; Tai Kwun did not need assistance from the Police under normal situations.

306. The Chairman invited Members to express their views on the issue.

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai said he had always opposed to the proposal to build a private hospital, as put forward by Reverend Peter Douglas KOON Ho-ming of HKSKH. He supported TPB to maintain the BHR there so that HKSKH’s proposal could not be realised. Mr KAM opined that buildings at Bishop Hill should all be listed as declared monuments. Besides, he opined that the entire area could be developed

as a historic town district. He hoped that C&WDC would propose to the Government and strive to transform the entire area of Bishop Hill to a historic town district. Mr KAM thanked CWCG and the civil society for voicing their opinions about the community. He said he felt disappointed that leaders of HKSKH took the lead in destroying Bishop Hill and he opined that the leaders should participate in conservation. He also criticised HKSKH leaders for thinking about destroying heritage. He said the leaders made every attempt to demolish heritage which had yet been listed as declared monuments. Hence, Mr KAM suggested that C&WDC reflect to relevant organisations that C&WDC wished to preserve Bishop Hill and did not agree with developing Bishop Hill. He hoped that a working group could be established to follow up the development. In addition, he requested that HKSKH must first consult C&WDC if there was any update on the proposal. He also suggested that Reverend Peter Douglas KOON Ho-ming, representative of HKSKH, be invited to sit in the meetings.

- (b) Ms NG Hoi-yan remarked that the whole Central and Western District, in addition to Bishop Hill, had to be conserved as well. Hence, she hoped that a working group could be set up to follow up the development of conservation. Ms NG also said that PMQ's glass floor should not be covered during exhibitions. She said PMQ should not cover up the Underground Interpretation Area when organising an exhibition. Besides, Ms NG asked whether Tai Kwun's security guards had received noise complaints and complaints about nuisance caused by drinkers between 11:00 pm and 2:00 am, when Tai Kwun was closed but the licensed liquor premises could still sell alcoholic drinks. Furthermore, she knew that Block 9 in Tai Kwun was under renovation and as seen from the photos provided by FEHD, loudspeakers had been installed there. She asked whether Tai Kwun had assessed if installing loudspeakers would affect the structure of the building and its conservation value.
- (c) Mr NG Siu-hong was concerned about Bishop Hill and he wished to preserve the original appearance of Bishop Hill as far as possible. Regarding the operation of Tai Kwun on Christmas Eve, he said although the Police had not entered the art space, anti-riot police officers had still been deployed inside the Police Service Centre in Tai Kwun. Mr NG asked whether Tai Kwun, as the governing body, had any responsibility to take, and whether there was any clause which defined the use of the Police Service Centre in Tai Kwun.
- (d) Mr YIP Kam-lung understood that the development of "Conserving Central" would not be discussed in the meeting. He said he would bring up what had happened in the TPB meeting in the following meeting. He said it was very ridiculous that

Reverend Peter Douglas KOON Ho-ming, representative of HKSKH, attempted to bypass C&WDC and requested TD to set up signs that day. In addition, Mr YIP opined that the problems of Tai Kwun were also part of “Conserving Central”. He opined that the reply of Ms Anita LO of JCCPS could hardly allay public concern. He hoped that Tai Kwun could provide photos or CCTV images, etc. to prove that the Police had not entered Tai Kwun that day. Mr YIP said artists and Tai Kwun users would be afraid when the Police entered the facilities at Tai Kwun. He hoped that Tai Kwun could undertake that Tai Kwun would deny the Police’s entry to the area of Tai Kwun if the Police had no evidence to prove that someone inside Tai Kwun had broken the law.

- (e) Mr HUI Chi-fung commented that idling the HKSKH site did no good to the community and it would instead occupy public resources of the community. Mr HUI agreed with Ms LAW’s suggestion and shared other Members’ views. He requested that a grading assessment for the buildings on Bishop Hill and the Compound as a whole be immediately conducted, with a view to conserving Bishop Hill. Besides, as a tender exercise regarding the GPO Building was going to be conducted and the building was going to be demolished, he hoped that C&WDC could express its stance on the development of the GPO Building as early as possible. Hence, he said he would put forward two impromptu motions: one would be about a request to conserve the Bishop Hill site of HKSKH and conduct a grading assessment for the buildings on Bishop Hill and the Compound as a whole; the other one would be about a request to conserve the GPO Building in Central, to conduct a grading assessment for and to revitalise the building for public use, and to oppose its demolition.
  
- (f) Ms NG Hoi-yan asked about the recovery of Block 4 at Tai Kwun and whether the design of the goggle-shaped window would be changed.

307. Ms Anita LO, Head of Facilities Management of JCCPS, responded to Members’ questions. She said that security guards would remind the persons concerned to avoid conducting any activity at public place after Tai Kwun was closed. She added that liquor licence holders still needed to shut the doors and windows, and stay in the specified indoor areas after a specified time, even if they had obtained a liquor licence. During some special occasions where there were more customers, Tai Kwun would close some areas to avoid large gatherings of people and causing nuisance. Ms LO continued that Tai Kwun had not received noise complaints related to the tenants for a long time. Regarding the installation of loudspeakers, Ms LO said all matters related to renovation must be examined and all examinations would be submitted to Antiquities and Monuments Office for approval. Upon completion of the renovation, Tai Kwun would conduct a review to ensure that the organisations

concerned had followed the approved plans. For the recovery of Block 4 at Tai Kwun, Ms LO said Tai Kwun would arrange a visit to Block 4 for C&WDC and would later contact C&WDC Secretariat. For the use of the Police Service Centre in Tai Kwun, Ms LO said that according to the information, the Police Service Centre was used only for case reporting and enquiries. As the Police Service Centre was a unit which operated independently, details about the operations could only be provided by the Police. Tai Kwun would discuss with the Police the use of the Police Service Centre when an opportunity arose in future. Ms LO said that according to Tai Kwun's guidelines, the Police could enter the area of Tai Kwun only if they had reasonable doubts or a search warrant. The same guidelines had also been given to the security staff by Tai Kwun. Security staff engaged by Tai Kwun was responsible for the security work inside Tai Kwun and Tai Kwun required no assistance from the Police if there was no illegal act inside Tai Kwun. According to the security guards' records, the Police had entered and exited the Police Service Centre on Christmas Eve. The security guards needed to report to the superiors of Tai Kwun if police officers had entered the area of Tai Kwun. In addition, security guards guarded Pottinger Gate round-the-clock to monitor the situation there.

308. The Chairman hoped that in future, when Tai Kwun leased its premises to restaurants which wished to apply for a liquor licence, Tai Kwun would request the restaurants not to sell alcoholic drinks after Tai Kwun was closed (i.e. 11:00 pm). She said she had made a relevant request in a previous Liquor Licensing Board meeting.

309. Mr NG Siu-hong asked whether Tai Kwun agreed that the action taken by the Police that day had already been in breach of the use of the Police Service Centre.

310. Ms Anita LO of JCCPS responded to Mr NG and said that she could not be sure if the action taken by the Police that day had been in breach of the tenancy agreement because she was not responsible for leasing matters. However, she would write down the questions and pass them to the colleagues concerned, and the colleagues would then communicate with the Police.

311. Mr NG Siu-hong hoped that JCCPS could give a written reply in response to the matter. He also asked when the tenancy agreement would be renewed. The Chairman asked whether the Police Service Centre could be used by the Police as a base for planning and for storing arms and ammunition like tear gas.

312. Ms Anita LO of JCCPS replied that she was not familiar with the contents and the term of the tenancy agreement because each tenancy agreement was handled separately. Hence, she could not provide a reply at the moment.

313. Mr NG Siu-hong requested that use restrictions be added in future tenancy



agreements. Ms Anita LO of JCCPS replied that she would reflect the request to the colleagues concerned.

[Post-meeting note: In response to Mr NG Siu-hong's questions about the use of the Police Service Centre and whether it was aligned with the contents of the tenancy agreement, the tenancy agreement signed between JCCPS and Government Property Agency stated that the premise was used as a Police Service Centre and its operational arrangements were not specified. The tenancy agreement also stipulated that the storage of dangerous goods must comply with the requirements set out in the local legislation. The term of the tenancy agreement was six years and the renewal term was three years.]

314. The Chairman invited Members to vote on the impromptu motions received in respect of the issue. She said the Secretariat had received two impromptu motions regarding the paper discussed. She added that she and the Members-elect then had lobbied TPB to lower the BHR of the Bishop Hill site of HKSKH in Central on 6 December 2019. The Chairman said a vote on the impromptu motions could be held only if more than one-third of Members agreed. More than one-third of Members agreed with voting on the two impromptu motions.

315. The following two impromptu motions were adopted after voting:

- Impromptu Motion:
- (1) Requesting the conservation of the Bishop Hill site of Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui in Central and conduct of a grading assessment for the buildings on Bishop Hill and the Compound as a whole.
  - (2) Requesting the conservation of the General Post Office Building in Central, conduct of a grading assessment for and revitalisation of the building for public use, and opposing its demolition.

(Proposed by Mr HUI Chi-fung and seconded by Mr NG Siu-hong)

(14 affirmative votes: Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Mr YIP Kam-lung)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

316. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked whether the motion about conserving the GPO Building was not part of “Conserving Central”.

317. The Chairman said that harbourfront site was included in the scope of “Conserving Central”. It was not a problem because the GPO Building was part of the harbourfront site under “Conserving Central”.

318. The Chairman ended the discussion on this item and thanked the guests for attending the meeting.

### **Item 12(iii): Lantau Tomorrow**

**(C&W DC Paper No. 27/2020)**

---

(10:27 pm)

319. The Chairman said CEDD had submitted a paper regarding “Lantau Tomorrow”. Mr CHU Yiu-chow, Acting Chief Engineer/S3 of South Development Office of CEDD, was supposed to present the paper but he had already left the conference room. Hence, the Chairman suggested handling the paper in the following meeting.

320. Members agreed with discussing the paper in the following meeting.

### **Item 13: Progress Report on the Central and Western District-led Actions Scheme and Work Foci**

**(C&W DC Paper No. 17/2020)**

---

(10:27 pm)

321. The Chairman said the paper was submitted by C&WDO and it would not be discussed in the meeting.

### **Item 14: Market Consultative Committee of Public Markets of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department**

**(C&W DC Paper No. 18/2020)**

---

(10:27 pm – 10:30 pm)

322. The Chairman said the paper was submitted by FEHD. As Ms LI Yat-fung, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western), had already left the conference room, the Chairman suggested putting the discussion on hold and discussing

the paper in the following meeting.

323. Mr KAM Nai-wai said the paper was about the arrangements for Members joining the Market Management Consultative Committees (MMCCs). Members of the constituencies could not join the respective MMCCs if C&WDC did not discuss the arrangements. He hoped that Members could first agree with letting Members of the constituencies join the respective MMCCs, so that the MMCCs could organise meetings successfully. For other issues such as whether it was necessary to increase or decrease the number of members in a MMCC, he opined that they could be discussed in the following meeting.

324. The Chairman said that according to the annex, Mr KAM Nai-wai was the Member of the constituency where Sheung Wan Market was located; Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin was the Member of the constituency where Sai Ying Pun Market was located; Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin was the Member of the constituency where Centre Street Market was located; Mr HO Chi-wang was the Member of the constituency where Shek Tong Tsui Market was located; Mr PANG Ka-ho was the Member of the constituency where Smithfield Market was located; and Mr KAM Nai-wai was the Member of the constituency where Queen Street Cooked Food Market was located. She suggested endorsing first the suggestion of letting Members who were responsible for the markets/cooked food market join the committees. As for which Members and how many of them would C&WDC recommend additionally, the Chairman said it could be discussed in the following meeting.

325. Mr KAM Nai-wai said he only agreed with letting Members who were responsible for the markets join the committees. As for how many additional Members would join the committees, it would be discussed in the following meeting.

326. The Chairman said only four Members of the constituencies had joined the respective MMCCs for the time being. Other Members could think about which MMCC to join and it would be discussed in the following meeting.

327. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he wished to join the committee for Shek Tong Tsui Market. However, he agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai and said it should be discussed in the following meeting.

328. Members agreed with the four Members first joining the MMCCs in their constituency.

**Item 15: Formation of Steering Committee/Working Groups under C&WDC and Related Arrangements**  
**(C&W DC Paper No. 26/2020)**

---

(10:31 pm – 11:16 pm)

329. The Chairman said steering committee/working groups under C&WDC were formed and related arrangements were made in accordance with the recommendations made by HAD on working groups. The total number of “standing working groups” could not exceed three times of the total number of committees under C&WDC. The upper limit of “standing working groups” was increased to 18 because Constitutional & Security Affairs Committee had been established in the current C&WDC term and there were six committees in total. The Chairman continued that a working group consisted of representatives of other organisations and at least four Members. In other words, specialists and representatives of other relevant organisations could be invited to join the working group. The working groups could decide themselves who to invite. As C&WDC had endorsed the cancellation of the appointment of co-opted members, there would be no co-opted members joining the working groups. Besides, the chairman of each working group should be elected in the relevant C&WDC and committee meetings. The committees would take care of the formation of their working groups themselves. The committees could refer to Annex D to G of the paper to know about the previous terms of reference (TOR) for the working groups under the committees.

330. Regarding the working groups under C&WDC, the Chairman said there had been two steering groups, namely Steering Committee on Signature Project in Central & Western District and Steering Committee on Healthy City in the Central and Western District, under C&WDC of the previous term. There had been six standing working groups also and they were (i) Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs; (ii) Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District; (iii) Working Group on Concern over the Development of the Central Police Station Compound and Former Police Married Quarters; (iv) Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront; (v) Working Group on Mid-levels Escalators in the Central & Western District; and (vi) Ad-hoc Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council. The establishment of Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council had been endorsed in the first meeting. As C&WDC had endorsed including building management in the TOR of Building Management, Environmental Hygiene & Works Committee (BEHWC), Members could discuss whether they should leave it to the committee to decide if Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District would be established. The Chairman suggested not establishing Steering Committee on Signature Project in Central & Western District because the signature project carried out

by C&WDC of the previous term (i.e. the four piers located in Sai Wan) had been completed. Members endorsed the suggestion.

331. The Vice-chairman suggested discussing the supervision of the signature project in Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront. He opined that the project was related to harbourfront.

332. Regarding Steering Committee on Healthy City in the Central and Western District, the Chairman said Central and Western District had joined the World Health Organization Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities and held the Health Festival every year at Sheung Wan Market or Smithfield Market, inviting dozens of non-governmental organisations to organise various activities such as body check (eye examination, urine test and blood pressure measurement, etc.) for the residents. The Chairman opined that it might not be necessary to continue to establish Steering Committee on Healthy City in the Central and Western District. Still, C&WDC could continue to promote “Health for All” by organising the Health Festival once or twice annually, as the elders were very fond of it. She opined that an ad-hoc group could be established to organise activities only when C&WDC organised the Health Festival; C&WDC could also choose to discuss whether the Health Festival would be held when C&WDC discussed the allocation of government funding during March or April.

333. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that the Health Festival be organised under Cultural, Education, Healthcare, Leisure & Social Affairs Committee (CLSAC), as the TOR of CLSAC included healthcare matters. C&WDC could consider setting up an ad-hoc working group under the committee. In the meantime, Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District should be established under BEHWC. Regarding C&WDC full council meetings, he suggested establishing Working Group on Town Planning of Central and Western District to discuss matters related to town planning. He also suggested replacing Working Group on Concern over the Development of the Central Police Station Compound and Former Police Married Quarters with a working group related to historic town district, so that it would no longer be necessary to discuss “Conserving Central” as a standing item in full council meetings, and “Conserving Central” could be discussed in the meetings of the working group which was related to historic town district.

334. The Vice-chairman suggested that Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District still be directly under the full council. He remarked that although there was BEHWC, the committee had a wide scope of job responsibilities; meanwhile, building management was a vital issue because there were many private buildings in Central and Western District. The Vice-chairman suggested

that Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District still be directly under the full council, given that many more working groups could still be established under the full council and the workload regarding private buildings was heavy.

335. Mr LEUNG Fong-wai said that to maintain consistency, it made more sense to put Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District under BEHWC. Otherwise, the public might be confused.

336. Ms NG Hoi-yan agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai that Working Group on Concern over the Development of the Central Police Station Compound and Former Police Married Quarters could be replaced with a working group that was related to historic town district. However, she opined that the element of heritage conservation should be included.

337. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he had submitted a paper together with other Members, suggesting establishing a working group on information technology under the full council to coordinate all work involving information technology in C&WDC (e.g. live broadcast of meetings) and all information technology projects implemented in Central and Western District (e.g. the smart lamppost project). Mr YIP said as far as he understood, the Government planned to launch the smart lamppost project also in Central and Admiralty. Besides, a Wi-Fi brand “Wi-Fi.HK” would also be introduced to all the Government’s public facilities in Hong Kong. Mr YIP opined that C&WDC was responsible for monitoring the projects and voicing opinions, and serving as a District Council (DC) which disclosed statistics and was transparent. Hence, he suggested establishing a working group on information technology. He hoped that Members would join the working group and make suggestions.

338. Ms NG Hoi-yan said there was no working group under Traffic & Transport Committee (TTC). As there would be two major traffic projects, including Electronic Road Pricing and Walk in HK, in Central and Western District in future, she asked whether it was necessary to establish relevant working groups.

339. Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with establishing two separate working groups regarding the projects. However, he opined that the Government had not prepared a concrete implementation schedule for Electronic Road Pricing; a working group could be established when the Government submitted papers to TTC.

340. The Chairman said TTC could decide itself if the two working groups would be established or not. She opined that it was necessary to first handle the matters related

to the working groups under the full council. She asked whether it was more ideal to put Working Group on Concern Over Building Management in the Central & Western District under BEHWC. The Vice-chairman said he respected the opinions expressed by Members.

341. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that Electronic Road Pricing and Walk in HK be followed up and handled by one working group. Although he did not know if the Government would implement the projects in the current term, the issues had already been discussed in the meetings in C&WDC of the previous term. In addition, he opined that C&WDC should study how to connect with the community and collect views from the community. He commented that information technology was one of the ways. Other examples included establishing a youth council and an elder council, which he and the Chairman had mentioned before, and further establishing external liaisons. He quoted the events related to opposing the proposed legislative amendments as an example and said international liaison played a very important role in the events. He suggested that the full council consider establishing a group concerning international and local liaisons, and naming it “DC Liaisons”, for example. As for whether the group should be combined with the working group on information technology, he opined that it could be discussed later.

342. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he had discussed with the elderly group of Caritas-Hong Kong the possibility of establishing an elderly council and the group was quite interested. However, he opined that it could be difficult for C&WDC to establish such a council. Hence, he suggested inviting non-governmental organisations to put forward nominations for guests in regular attendance in Working Group on Elderly Service and thereby promoting the elderly council through the working group. A relevant working group could also be established to handle issues related to the youth council. For international liaisons, he opined that including relevant responsibilities in the working group on information technology was not quite appropriate. Mr YIP also opined that it was necessary for C&WDC to deal with foreign affairs and exchange with other foreign cities in a reciprocal manner. He emphasised that it had nothing to do with the Central Authorities’ defence and foreign affairs, and he opined that the matter could be handled internally in C&WDC. As for whether a working group dedicated to handling it should be established, Mr YIP said he would leave it to C&WDC to discuss it. It was just that it did not seem to be aligned with the functions of Working Group on Information Technology.

343. Mr LEUNG Fong-wai agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai that a working group could be established to handle the foreign affairs of C&WDC, to facilitate exchanges with councils outside Hong Kong and to even establish long-lasting relations with them, with

a view to encouraging mutual learning and improving C&WDC's work on managing the district. However, he opined that it was not necessary to rush to establish the working group and it could be discussed in the following meeting.

344. Mr KAM Nai-wai commented that the term "foreign affairs" was not very appropriate. He opined that it was better to use "international exchanges" because other DCs had also engaged in international exchange programmes, such as visiting Singapore, before.

345. The Chairman concluded that Members had suggested establishing working groups which included: Working Group on Information Technology, Working Group on Historic Town District and Heritage Conservation, Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront, Working Group on Town Planning of Central and Western District, Working Group on Mid-levels Escalators in the Central & Western District, Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs and Ad-hoc Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council (The establishment of Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council had already been endorsed in the first meeting.).

346. Mr YIP Kam-lung said other DCs had an in-house working group. The Chairman responded that Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs was the same as the in-house working groups in other DCs.

347. The Chairman said that a working group had to consist of at least four Members. She asked whether there was any Member who was willing to join Working Group on Information Technology. At least four Members raised their hands indicating that they would like to join the group.

348. The Chairman asked whether there was any Member who was willing to join Working Group on Historic Town District and Heritage Conservation. At least four Members raised their hands indicating that they would like to join the group.

349. The Chairman asked whether there was any Member who was willing to join Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront. At least four Members raised their hands indicating that they would like to join the group.

350. The Chairman asked whether there was any Member who was willing to join Working Group on Town Planning of Central and Western District. At least four Members raised their hands indicating that they would like to join the group.



351. The Chairman asked whether there was any Member who was willing to join Working Group on Mid-levels Escalators in the Central & Western District. At least four Members raised their hands indicating that they would like to join the group.

352. The Chairman asked whether there was any Member who was willing to join Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs. At least four Members raised their hands indicating that they would like to join the group. The Chairman said the Secretariat would officially write to Members later and invite them to join the working groups, in order to keep a record. She called upon the Members who had agreed to join to give an affirmative response.

353. The Chairman announced that the relevant working groups had been formed successfully. She suggested electing the chairman for each working group immediately.

354. The Chairman invited Members to elect the chairman of Working Group on Information Technology. Mr HO Chi-wang nominated Mr YIP Kam-lung as the chairman and Miss YAM Ka-yi seconded. Mr YIP Kam-lung accepted the nomination.

355. The Chairman invited Members to elect the chairman of Working Group on Historic Town District and Heritage Conservation. Mr YIP Kam-lung nominated Ms NG Hoi-yan as the chairman and Mr HO Chi-wang seconded. Ms NG Hoi-yan accepted the nomination.

356. The Chairman invited Members to elect the chairman of Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront. Mr YIP Kam-lung nominated Mr WONG Weng-chi as the chairman and Mr PANG Ka-ho seconded. Mr WONG Weng-chi accepted the nomination.

357. The Chairman invited Members to elect the chairman of Working Group on Town Planning of Central and Western District. Mr LEUNG Fong-wai nominated Ms WONG Kin-ching as the chairman and Mr YIP Kam-lung seconded. Ms WONG Kin-ching accepted the nomination.

358. The Chairman invited Members to elect the chairman of Working Group on Mid-levels Escalators in the Central & Western District. Ms NG Hoi-yan nominated Mr NG Siu-hong as the chairman and Ms CHENG Lai-king seconded. Mr NG Siu-hong accepted the nomination.

359. The Chairman invited Members to elect the chairman of Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs. Mr YIP Kam-lung nominated Ms CHENG

Lai-king as the chairman and Mr LEUNG Fong-wai seconded. Ms CHENG Lai-king accepted the nomination.

360. C&WDC endorsed the term of office of the working groups: the term of office would be two years and another election would be held afterwards. Regarding the TOR of each working group, the working groups needed to submit their TOR to the full council after drafting them.

361. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked whether they could continue to discuss the paper after the TOR was discussed in the first working group meeting. The Chairman said they could do so but the TOR had to be first discussed.

362. The Secretary said the TOR of the working groups must be within the scope set out in District Councils Ordinance; it was a basic requirement for establishing the working groups.

363. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he learnt that in other DCs, Tai Po District Council, for example, the TOR of its Security and Constitutional Affairs Committee was objected by the relevant District Office, saying that it was in breach of District Councils Ordinance. Mr YIP hoped that relevant parties could raise the issue as early as possible once the working groups submitted papers related to the TOR.

364. The Chairman opined that the working groups could set out their TOR in accordance with their job responsibilities. Members could discuss again if HAD or District Officer made an objection.

365. Mr YIP Kam-lung put forward an impromptu motion. He said the impromptu motion was not only about establishing Working Group on Information Technology; part of it was also related to Islands District Council (IsDC). He hoped that views of C&WDC could be aired to IsDC after the motion was endorsed. The Chairman said Mr YIP had tabled a paper. She then handled the impromptu motion stated in the paper. The impromptu motion was proposed by Mr YIP Kam-lung and seconded by Miss YAM Ka-yi. The impromptu motion was: "To step up popularisation of information technology in Central and Western District, a motion is proposed to establish Working Group on Information Technology under C&WDC, with a view to promoting the information technology work in C&WDC and in Central and Western District. Besides, C&WDC should disclose the statistics and broadcast DC meetings live together with IsDC or on its own".

366. The Chairman asked whether IsDC had confirmed not to broadcast DC

meetings live. Mr YIP Kam-lung said IsDC had already voted against broadcasting DC meetings live. As C&WDC and IsDC shared the conference room, Mr YIP hoped that by putting forward the motion, agreement on the live broadcast facilities in the conference room could be reached between C&WDC and IsDC.

367. Mr KAM Nai-wai said the work of C&WDC was unrelated to IsDC so he opined that the motion should not involve IsDC. It was just a technical issue regarding whether or not C&WDC would share the resources with IsDC in future. He suggested deleting “together with IsDC or on its own” and changing the sentence to “Besides, C&WDC should disclose the statistics and broadcast DC meetings live” in the motion. He did not hope that the motion would become a source of pressure to IsDC and he reiterated that the work of C&WDC should not be related to IsDC. Besides, he did not understand why Mr YIP Kam-lung put forward the impromptu motion. He said given that Working Group on Information Technology had already been established, relevant work could be followed up in that working group.

368. The Chairman responded that the tabled paper was supposed to be a discussion paper submitted by Mr YIP Kam-lung. It was just that the quota for the discussion papers of the meeting had been full and so, Mr YIP instead tabled the paper and put forward the impromptu motion under the item in which working groups were discussed. The other questions asked in the paper would be discussed in the meetings of Working Group on Information Technology in future.

369. Mr KAM Nai-wai opined that the impromptu motion put forward should be related to the issue discussed (the establishment of working groups under C&WDC). As the impromptu motion was related to information technology and information technology was not an issue discussed in the meeting, he suggested discussing it in future meetings of the Working Group on Information Technology, and submitting the impromptu motion to the full council after it was endorsed in a meeting of the group.

370. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked whether the impromptu motion could be discussed under “Any Other Business” on the agenda. He said C&WDC and IsDC shared the conference room and IsDC had already objected to the live broadcast of DC meetings. Some Members and he opined that IsDC should take its stance regarding C&WDC deciding to broadcast meetings live. He understood that different Members might have different opinions and he welcomed Members to express their views.

371. Mr KAM Nai-wai disagreed with discussing the impromptu motion under “Any Other Business” on the agenda. He commented that any other business on the agenda should not come out of nowhere. He agreed that there should be a mechanism

which allowed Members to put forward impromptu motions but he opined that the public should know before the meeting that there would be a discussion on the issue, and an impromptu motion should be put forward when the issue was discussed. In addition, he reiterated that C&WDC could discuss with IsDC the issue concerning live broadcast but it was unnecessary to exert pressure on IsDC through putting forward a motion, as there should be mutual respect among DCs. Besides, it did not seem to be a good way to maintain the good rapport when C&WDC, having known that IsDC had endorsed not broadcasting meetings live, went on with endorsing the motion. He emphasised that C&WDC could continue to discuss with IsDC the issue concerning live broadcast but it was inappropriate to exert pressure on IsDC through putting forward a motion.

372. The Vice-chairman commented that to show respect, the motion should not involve IsDC and should not have any intention of influencing or coercing IsDC. If necessary, the Secretariat could contact IsDC. The Vice-chairman also agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai that an impromptu motion which was put forward in accordance with the procedure should be related to the issues discussed in the meeting. He opined that it was procedural justice to let the public know about the agenda in advance. He said Mr YIP Kam-lung was the chairman of the Working Group on Information Technology and he could convene a meeting to discuss the issue.

373. Mr HO Chi-wang also agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai. He said it was inappropriate to set a precedent in which motions being put forward involved other DCs, as other DCs might put forward similar motions reciprocally and request C&WDC to take its stance in future.

374. Mr YIP Kam-lung opined that C&WDC and IsDC were equal and there existed no situation where one party coerced the other party. It was just that C&WDC sharing the conference room with IsDC was a special circumstance and so, he put forward a motion which involved IsDC. He was not exerting pressure on IsDC and the motion only said: “together with IsDC or on its own”. In other words, IsDC could choose not to broadcast meetings live and he only wanted to express that C&WDC would surely broadcast meetings live. Mr YIP also agreed that an impromptu motion should be related to the discussion items being discussed on the day. He said he could withdraw the impromptu motion if Members opined that putting forward the impromptu motion was not in accordance with proper procedures, since the motion would not be agreed by one-third of Members. Still, he hoped that it could be put on record that he had submitted the discussion paper and motion through normal channel; it could not be included in the agenda and be discussed simply because the number of discussion papers had exceeded the limit. The paper had been submitted by him and other Members, and the motion was not added at the last minute because it was out of order. He wished to clarify about it.

375. Ms NG Hoi-yan said IsDC had decided not to broadcast meetings live. She asked how Members would respond if IsDC put forward a motion demanding C&WDC not to broadcast meetings live. Ms NG was worried that C&WDC involving other DCs in the motion would set a precedent and induce other DCs to follow suit.

376. Mr KAM Nai-wai said Members had reached agreement in the meeting held on 2 January that papers related to events opposing the proposed legislative amendments would mainly be discussed in the meeting and the meeting would still adopt the arrangements. Emergencies such as epidemic prevention and Star Ferry Pier incident were also discussed in the meeting only because they were rather urgent or had a deadline. Mr KAM opined that Members might have different views probably because the new C&WDC had just started to run. He believed that C&WDC would run more smoothly once Members became familiar with the council procedures, such as time of speaking and speaking arrangements.

377. Mr YIP Kam-lung responded that he had submitted the paper in a rush because he wished to implement information technology and because he agreed with KAM Nai-wai that broadcasting meetings live was necessary. Mr YIP also said he understood agreement had been reached in the meeting held on 2 January that incidents induced by the "anti-extradition to China" movement and some other emergencies would mainly be discussed in the meeting. As IsDC would hold its second meeting on 20 January and he learnt that pro-democracy DC members in Islands District also wanted to broadcast meetings live, he hoped that C&WDC could take its stance and facilitate the live broadcast of IsDC meetings. He also responded to Ms NG Hoi-yan. He opined that all DCs were on the same level in the structure. Given that DCs could exchange ideas with other overseas councils or cities, DCs should also be able to exchange ideas with each other on an equal basis.

378. Ms NG Hoi-yan remarked that there could be exchanges between the DCs but she expressed concern over whether C&WDC needed to comply with or consider the request if another DC put forward a motion demanding C&WDC to take certain actions.

379. Both Mr KAM Nai-wai and the Vice-chairman opined that as it was late and given that the impromptu motion had no urgency and there were still other agenda items to be discussed, they suggested that Mr YIP Kam-lung withdraw the motion.

380. Mr YIP Kam-lung said he was willing to withdraw the motion but he wished to discuss in Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council whether C&WDC could include other DCs in its motions.

**Item 16: Use of C&WDC Funds and Noting the Allocations by C&WDC (2016-2019)**

**(C&W DC Paper No. 07/2020)**

---

(11:16 pm – 11:32 pm)

381. The Chairman welcomed Mr LEE Tin-chi, Executive Officer of C&WDO, to the meeting.

382. Mr LEE Tin-chi of C&WDO said C&WDC had earmarked a total of \$1,810,833.70 for use for the period from 1 January to 31 March 2020. In the first C&WDC meeting, Members had agreed to earmark a funding of \$180,332 for nine non-governmental organisations to apply for and the fund applications would be discussed in the first Finance Committee (FC) meeting on 23 January. Besides, C&WDC had endorsed an allocation of \$720 for producing four banners for “Meet-the-Public Scheme” in the said meeting. Members had also endorsed earmarking \$278,300 for the additional expenditure arising from the pay adjustment for Executive Assistants. He continued that Members had just endorsed earmarking \$200,000 for purchasing masks and other anti-epidemic supplies as well, and \$19,500 had to be earmarked for the fund application regarding the live broadcast of DC meetings. Deducting the above-mentioned expenditure, C&WDC had \$1,131,981.70 left for allocation. He said questionnaires had been sent to Members earlier in accordance with C&WDC’s request and some Members had suggested using the funding to launch anti-rodent operations in Central and Western District. The operations aimed to serve the residents in Central and Western District, and to remind the public how to prevent rodent infestation, to carry out anti-rodent work in buildings and to step up cleaning. He asked whether Members agreed to earmark funding to perform the operations.

383. The Chairman invited discussion on the paper. Members’ questions and opinions were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai asked whether the Secretariat had studied how much street washing and wall washing cost. He agreed with carrying out anti-rodent work. However, he opined that the work was specialised and he asked whether it was necessary to discuss with FEHD to see whether relevant facilities should be purchased and manpower should be increased. In addition, he asked whether work on clearing refuse could be conducted. He also asked whether street wardens could be arranged to keep records of bars and restaurants in SoHo disposing of refuse improperly at night, to reflect the situation then to FEHD and to assist the department

to initiate prosecutions. He opined that this type of work could first be trialled on a short-term basis. If the outcome was ideal, C&WDC could study again to see if long-term arrangements should be made.

- (b) Mr NG Siu-hong agreed with arranging for staff for monitoring and recording in SoHo on a trial basis after FEHD got off work.
- (c) Mr WONG Weng-chi added that street washing had also been mentioned when funding allocation had been discussed in the previous meeting.
- (d) Miss YAM Ka-yi opined that it was necessary to follow up street washing. She also agreed that there could be civilian wardens. She said that in Taiwan, the public also kept records of illegal parking of their own accord. She opined that similar practices could be adopted to handle the problems of illegal parking and dog droppings. If civilian wardens observed any offence at night, they could immediately give warnings and advice to the offenders, with a view to achieving the deterrent effect.
- (e) Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with arranging for civilian wardens to monitor the offences such as illegal parking and dog droppings. He suggested that civilian wardens wear clothing which was imprinted with the name of C&WDC and remind the public not to commit offences. He opined that the suggestion could improve the employment rate. In addition, he mentioned that no police patrolled in Central and Western District those days and hence, he suggested arranging for relevant staff to patrol the area. He hoped that the Secretariat could provide information regarding the rate for the staff engaged on a short-term and a long-term basis.
- (f) The Chairman suggested that the Secretariat first gather relevant information and then submit it to C&WDC full council for discussion. The application would then be submitted to a FC meeting for approval.
- (g) Mr YIP Kam-lung said some merchants had complained that the containers had suffered arson attacks and resulted in a great loss. He hoped that civilian wardens could patrol there.
- (h) Mr PANG Ka-ho opined that the idea of civilian wardens was ideal but it was necessary to study the terms of reference. They should define carefully if the post was under C&WDC or other departments. He opined that the details should be discussed thoroughly and law enforcement power could not be simply conferred to civilian wardens. If the monitoring was ineffective or if there was mishandling, it

would arouse public antipathy and the consequence would be dire.

- (i) Mr KAM Nai-wai agreed with Mr PANG Ka-ho. He opined that civilian wardens had not received training and could not enforce the law definitely. He suggested that civilian wardens only keep records and pass the information to relevant departments for follow-up actions. Mr KAM also commented that they should not confront the public directly. He opined that there would not be much time to train the civilian wardens before 31 March and he suggested reviewing in the following financial year whether the practice should be adopted on a long-term basis. Hence, he suggested changing the name of the post from “civilian warden” to “civilian observer”. The observers would only observe the situation and keep records, with the aim of monitoring offences such as illegal parking, restaurants committing offences and dog fouling.
- (j) Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai. He agreed that the observers should only keep records and avoid causing conflicts with the public directly. He opined that the most important thing was that they could report the information to C&WDC so that C&WDC could communicate with relevant departments and find a solution.

384. Mr LEE Tin-chi of C&WDO welcomed Members to voice their opinions. However, he pointed out that according to an article in Manual on the Use of District Council Funds, a project would not normally be supported by a District Council if it was a project that was more appropriately charged to other government or departmental votes. He quoted street washing as an example and said it was usually done by FEHD. In connection with this type of fund applications, the Secretariat would further discuss with Home Affairs Department to see if there was anything C&WDC had to pay attention to when endorsing the funding; the Secretariat would report to Members again when necessary.

385. The Chairman agreed that Mr LEE Tin-chi of C&WDO could consult HAD when necessary, before reporting to Members.

386. Mr KAM Nai-wai said the expenditure on anti-rodent work could not be estimated for the time being. He suggested discussing it in the following meeting and he asked the Secretariat to first gather information.

387. The Chairman agreed to continue the discussion in the FC meeting on 23 January. She wished to use the remaining funding by March to avoid wastage.



### **Item 17: Any Other Business**

(11:33 pm – 11:59 pm)

388. The Chairman asked the Vice-chairman that regarding the leaving of the officials just now, whether there was any urgent document needed to be handled.

389. The Vice-chairman said that in response to CoP leaving in the middle of the meeting and the District Officer leading other officials to leave the meeting, HAD had issued a statement saying that C&WDC had moved an impromptu motion against the Police and CoP and the motion made unfounded allegations against the Police. As the Government disagreed with the impromptu practice of C&WDC as well as the stance of the motion, all members of the Government in attendance had walked out of the meeting. He opined that it seemed to reflect both the attitude of the District Officer and the stance of HAD. He believed that the Government would follow the same policy in future and would do what they had done in the meeting: government officials would walk out of the meeting whenever Members moved a motion they found disagreeable. He opined that it was an action which undermined the power of C&WDC and it was also disrespectful to C&WDC. He opined that the Government wished that C&WDC had only one voice or would become its rubber stamp, supporting the policies implemented by the Government. The action had already violated section 61 of District Councils Ordinance, regarding listening to public opinion. He opined that government officials must stay in the meeting and listen to the public's opinions no matter the opinions were agreeable or not. Therefore, he opined that C&WDC must take action when the Government had adopted such a policy. Besides, the Vice-chairman said the Chief Executive had also published a post in relation to the incident just then, saying that non-pro-establishment Members had, through different means, made unfounded allegations against CoP and the Police, hurled abuse at them, moved a motion to censure them and destroyed the established order of C&WDC as well as the basis of mutual respect between Members and officials. The post also said that CoP, being neither humble nor pushy and advancing his arguments robustly, served as a role model for other heads of government departments who also had to attend DC meetings in future. The Vice-chairman opined that it clearly showed that government officials walking out of the meeting was a policy adopted by the Government, and the District Officer had also been carrying out political missions. The Vice-chairman opined that the problem was very serious and would severely affect all members of the public and the operation of DCs, as all government officials would walk out of DC meetings in future whenever they heard some disagreeable views. In the meantime, he said many members of the public hoped that the case could be submitted to and handled by Office of The Ombudsman. He opined that the case should be submitted to and handled by the Ombudsman, given that HAD and even the entire Government had already taken a specific political stance. He requested the Ombudsman to establish a case and investigate whether the District Officer had led all officials to walk out of the meeting because opinions expressed by the public were disagreeable.

390. Mr KAM Nai-wai did not object to requesting the Ombudsman to establish a case and investigate the incident. He opined that it was a serious matter. He said he had been a Member for some 30 years and he had never seen a government official walking out of the meeting because of disagreements. He questioned whether the action had violated Basic Law, laws of Hong Kong and government policies. He also said future development of the situation would affect the future operation of C&WDC and he still had not come up with a specific action in response to the incident. He asked whether a special meeting could be held to discuss it before the following meeting, to seek a solution together and to avoid similar incident from happening again. For example, they could urge the public to take to the streets and protest, hang banners in the district, or publicise the incident through C&WDC's official channel. He said he made the suggestion because DC Members had also hanged banners in the venues in the districts to object to disbanding Urban Council when the Government had intended to disband Urban Council in the past. He opined that it was necessary to tell the public that the Government was an incompetent puppet government. Moreover, he said the Chairman requesting the police officers to produce their warrant card had already evoked strong responses on the Internet. He believed that C&WDC had to set out rules of C&WDC and request the Police to comply with them when the Police attended C&WDC meetings in future, as he anticipated that C&WDC would focus on the Police and the problem of police brutality would be discussed more often in future, and the commanders of the Police would be protected by other police officers when they attended the meetings to answer questions. Hence, he opined that proper procedures should be adopted to tackle the situation where plainclothes and uniformed police officers attended meetings in future. Mr KAM described the police officers as "shameless" and said they "thought they were not involved in police brutality". He hoped that meetings could be organised in future to discuss how police officers should be received.

391. The Chairman responded and said Ms BOOK King-shun, Executive Officer I (District Council) of C&WDO, had told her that every attendee must register and wear a name tag provided by C&WDO as proof of identity in the meeting. Hence, she had requested the police officers to produce their warrant card as well.

392. Mr YIP Kam-lung opined that the replies given by the Chief Executive and HAD showed that they completely disregarded C&WDC. Hence, they, as Members, must defend C&WDC's dignity. He also agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai. He said Mr KAM Nai-wai was experienced and had supported keeping Urban Council in the past. He remarked that Members could carry out other actions, in addition to issuing statements and requesting Office of The Ombudsman to investigate the case. He said some members of the public had asked whether an application for judicial review could be made but he opined that applying for a judicial review would cost a lot of money and would be inappropriate under the system. He hoped that in respect of international anti-corruption efforts and exchanges with councils of

other countries, Members could explore the possibility of publishing an open letter in the name of C&WDC, telling foreign councils the condemnation statement made by C&WDC, as well as the reactions of the Chief Executive, the Police and HAD to the impromptu motion moved by C&WDC, with a view to reflecting how DC in Hong Kong was not being respected by the Government.

393. The Chairman said the decision could be made when a special meeting was held.

394. The Vice-chairman agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai and Mr YIP Kam-lung. However, he opined that a letter should be sent to Office of The Ombudsman as early as possible because it was the fastest and easiest way, and the public was expecting it. As HAD and the Chief Executive had already issued statements, he suspected that they had planned it since long ago. He suggested writing to Office of The Ombudsman in the name of C&WDC and attached the statement with the letter, requesting the Ombudsman to establish a case and to investigate if the District Officer had been derelict in her duties. He opined that it was an action that could be taken immediately and he agreed that Members could discuss other matters again in future. He asked whether Members agreed with him.

395. The Chairman asked the Vice-chairman whether the letter would be written and sent by Members themselves. The Vice-chairman said the letter should be sent by the Secretariat, as motions had always been sent by the Secretariat as well.

396. The Chairman said C&WDC would be the plaintiff if a letter was sent to Office of The Ombudsman.

397. The Vice-chairman said C&WDC would be the complainant who requested the Ombudsman to establish a case and investigate it. The Secretariat would write to the Ombudsman for C&WDC and the Ombudsman could start the investigation upon receiving the letter. At that moment, Members in attendance needed to agree to write to the Ombudsman, to request her to establish a case and investigate whether the District Officer had been derelict in her duties, as it seemed to be useless to complain to the Chief Executive or to HAD. The Government had issued a statement to support the action taken by the government officials and it would affect the future operation of C&WDC. He opined that the incident should be investigated by the Ombudsman, which was neutral. He also hoped that the Ombudsman could investigate it right away because HAD and the Chief Executive had already issued statements censuring the action taken by C&WDC Members. He hoped that they could first request the Secretariat to write to the Ombudsman.

398. Mr KAM Nai-wai said they should not put the Secretariat in a difficult situation. The Chairman agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai. Mr KAM Nai-wai said it would not be too

difficult for Members to draft the letter.

399. The Chairman said all the 14 Members in attendance could go to Office of The Ombudsman together to express their expectations.

400. Mr KAM Nai-wai agreed that Members could go to Office of The Ombudsman together on the following day. He said it was already past 11:00 pm and no reporters would report the incident. However, Members going to Office of The Ombudsman together to submit the letter on the following day would attract media coverage and would definitely produce certain effects. He suggested that other actions be discussed and handled in the special meetings. He said some Members were not in attendance; as the actions suggested, such as establishing international liaisons and conducting an investigation formally in the name of C&WDC, needed to be endorsed through the established procedure, he hoped that the Members who were not in attendance could also learn about the follow-up actions. He opined that it was better to handle the incident thoroughly.

401. Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai.

402. The Chairman asked whether Members could spare some time on the following day. She asked whether Members were available at, for example, 2:00 pm.

403. The Vice-chairman and Mr YIP Kam-lung said they could make time to join the activity.

404. Mr WONG Weng-chi suggested meeting up at 3:30 pm. He said FEHD would hold an activity to distribute red packet envelopes on the same day.

405. The Vice-chairman asked whether Members agreed unanimously to go to Office of The Ombudsman on the following day. He opined that a vote must be conducted to show that the entire C&WDC agreed to it and it was not a decision made only by some Members.

406. The Chairman asked whether Members agreed to go to Office of The Ombudsman on the following day. She hoped that Members could take part in it.

407. Mr YIP Kam-lung asked whether only the Member of the constituency where Shek Tong Tsui Market was located needed to join the distribution of red packet envelopes organised by FEHD.

408. The Chairman said the distribution of red packet envelopes could be finished within a short period of time in the past.

409. Mr YIP Kam-lung said Miss YAM Ka-yi needed to pay a prison visit at 3:00 pm that day.

410. The Chairman asked whether Members wished to go to Office of The Ombudsman in the morning. However, she was afraid that time would be tight and the preparation work could not be finished on time.

411. Miss YAM Ka-yi asked whether they could go to Office of The Ombudsman at 1:00 pm.

412. The Chairman worried that 1:00 pm was the meal break time of the Office of The Ombudsman.

413. The Vice-chairman suggested visiting the Office of The Ombudsman at 2:30 pm, remarking that the Ombudsman should have returned to her office by this time. He pointed out that issuing a press release also took time, so 2:30 pm would be more appropriate.

414. The Chairman asked whether the suggested time (i.e. 2:30 pm) would affect those Members attending the event of distributing red packet envelopes. She said that Members could take a group photo and jointly issue the letter, while delegating a few Members to get inside the Office of The Ombudsman to discuss the incident.

415. Members discussed matters relating to the issuing of letter, statement or liaison with the media.

416. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that the suggestion put forward by him of visiting the Office of The Ombudsman the day after the meeting was not a decision of the whole Council. He said that Members were not lodging a complaint to the Ombudsman on behalf of the Council on that day, and the relevant decision should be endorsed at the next C&WDC meeting. Regarding the discussion just now, he was merely suggesting the 14 C&WDC Members to file a complaint with the Ombudsman. Remarking that the decision for the whole Council to file a complaint with the Ombudsman a major one, he considered it more desirable for the decision to be considered for endorsement at the next formal meeting. Hence, the division of labour among Members in regard to issuing the letter could be discussed in private.

417. Mr YIP Kam-lung shared the view of Mr KAM Nai-wai.

418. The Vice-chairman raised another matter under “Any other business”, saying that quite a number of unidentified observers were shouting in the public gallery just now and the

situation was out of control. The Chairman had warned those people several times but failed to make them leave. He asked if the chaotic situation was allowed to go on. He reckoned that in future whenever there were discussion topics concerning the Government, a group of citizens would attend the meeting to give support to the Government. He asked whether it was necessary to uphold the dignity and rules of the Council, and suggested that for future meetings, members of the public must register their personal information before entering the conference room. He hoped Members would consider this suggestion.

419. Mr KAM Nai-wai said the matter could be referred to the Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs or the Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council to consider carefully about the arrangement for seats in the public gallery. Reference could also be made to the practices adopted by other DCs. He opined that the proposed arrangement of registering personal information would be sensitive. He remarked that the Chairman had handled the meeting properly. He opined that as the new Council term had just begun, some members of the public might not be aware that clapping hands during meetings was inappropriate. He supported the lenient approach adopted by the Chairman in handling the matter at the meeting, which could facilitate public understanding of the Council's operation. He also asked whether the notice on the wall behind the public gallery contained clauses of the Standing Orders.

420. Ms BOOK King-shun, Executive Officer I (District Council) of the C&WDO, responded that the notice contained clauses of the Standing Orders. The notice stated that those who caused disturbance to the meeting would be ordered to leave.

421. Mr KAM Nai-wai believed that it may be necessary to set out in detail acts that were not in line with the Standing Orders, such as clapping hands, chanting slogans, answering phone calls, etc., and to state that those who did such acts would be required to leave the conference room. This would make it clear to the public the requirements of the Council. He agreed that the new Council could adopt a lenient approach in this respect, and pointed out that in a special meeting of the last Council, most of the elderly observers acted even more aggressively than the observers of this meeting. The elders present at this meeting were gentler when expressing their opinions. He believed that elders could be treated more leniently as they did not have huge impact on the Council's operation. The Chairman must be careful about the degree of stringency in handling matters.

422. Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai that the matter regarding registration of personal information should be referred to the Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council for discussion, as this would involve whether provisions on conduct of the public would be added to the Standing Orders. As far as he understood, the LegCo had relevant provisions as well as provisions on speaking by

members of the public. He cited an example that a former C&WDC Member had seated before the Chairman invited him to. He opined that rules could be made to inform the public about the relevant arrangements on speaking at meetings. He said that although this would increase the workload on the Secretariat, as long as the relevant rules were implemented right from the start, it would be easy to follow up in the future. He hoped that the matter could be discussed at meetings of the Working Group on Review of Standing Orders of Central and Western District Council.

423. The Vice-chairman hoped that the Secretariat could gather information on the approaches adopted by other DCs in handling members of the public at meetings. He also hoped that Members would consider adding a procedure of ringing of bell before voting took place to notify Members that they should return to the conference room to vote. He said it was possible that Members might have gone to the lavatory or need to answer an important phone call without realising that they needed to cast a vote, especially as the system of proxy voting was abolished.

424. Mr YIP Kam-lung suggested that the arrangement could be discussed at meetings of the Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs. He pointed out that the relevant equipment could be purchased with DC funds.

425. The Vice-chairman said that he did not mind discussing the arrangement at meetings of the Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs, but the arrangement still had to be submitted to the full Council for approval even if it was endorsed by the working group.

426. The Chairman asked whether the Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs could discuss the purchase of a large clock to show the time-count.

427. Mr YIP Kam-lung agreed.

428. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that this kind of timer could be purchased in Apliu Street and cost \$1,000, and only cost \$500 if purchased online from Taobao.

429. Mr YIP Kam-lung disagreed with purchasing online from Taobao.

430. The Chairman suggested installing a digital clock for counting the two-minute speaking time.

431. The Vice-chairman suggested that in the event that a timer could not be purchased in time, online timer could be used for the time being, so that Members could clearly see the

time-count.

432. Ms BOOK King-shun of the C&WDO said that the timer could not be displayed at the same time if PowerPoint slides were being displayed. She said that a timer could be purchased.

433. Mr KAM Nai-wai said a clock with good functions could be purchased at Apliu Street with around \$2,000. This type of clocks was equipped with the remote control and alarm features.

434. Ms BOOK King-shun of C&WDO said that Sha Tin District Council also used a similar clock. She would try to purchase one too.

435. The Chairman said the clock could be purchased using DC funds.

436. Mr YIP Kam-lung said the equipment could be used together with IsDC only if IsDC was willing to share the cost.

437. The Chairman said the equipment was owned and used only by C&WDC.

438. The Chairman asked whether C&WDC was going to organise a Cantonese opera show.

439. Ms BOOK King-shun of C&WDO said a funding application had been made in 2019 to implement “Spring Cantonese Opera Show”, and the activity was followed up by Working Group on Central & Western District Council Affairs. The activity had been under preparation and Hong Kong City Hall had been booked for 20 February for organising two performances. Members would be invited to be the officiating guests.

### **Item 18: Date of the Next Meeting**

(11:59 pm – 12:00 am)

440. The Chairman announced that the third meeting would be held on 19 March 2020. The paper submission deadline for government departments would be 27 February 2020, while that for Members would be 4 March 2020.

The minutes were \_\_\_\_\_ confirmed on 25 May 2020



Chairman: Ms CHENG Lai-king

Secretary: Ms YEUNG Wing-shan, Grace

Central and Western District Council Secretariat  
May 2020