

Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Eastern District Council

Date: 7 January 2020 (Tuesday)

Time: 11:00 am

Venue: Eastern District Council Conference Room

<u>Present</u>	<u>Time of Arrival</u> <u>(am)</u>	<u>Time of Departure</u> <u>(pm)</u>
Ms CHAU Hui-yan	11:00	end of meeting
Mr WONG Chun-sing, Patrick	11:00	end of meeting
Mr KU Kwai-yiu	11:00	end of meeting
Mr HO Wai-lun	11:00	end of meeting
Mr NG Cheuk-ip	11:00	end of meeting
Mr LEE Yue-shun	11:00	end of meeting
Ms LEE Ching-har, Annie	11:00	end of meeting
Ms ISHIGAMI LEE Fung-king, Alice	11:00	end of meeting
Mr YUEN Kin-chung, Kenny	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHOW Cheuk-ki	11:00	end of meeting
Ms WEI Siu-lik	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHUI Chi-kin	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHEUNG Chun-kit	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-cheong	11:00	end of meeting
Mr LEUNG Siu-sun, Patrick	11:00	end of meeting
Ms LEUNG Wing-sze	11:00	end of meeting
Mr KWOK Chi-chung	11:00	end of meeting
Mr KWOK Wai-keung, JP	11:00	2:07
Mr CHAN Ka-yau, Jason	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHAN Wing-tai	11:00	end of meeting
Ms CHAN Po-king	11:00	end of meeting
Mr MAK Tak-ching	11:00	end of meeting
Ms FU Kai-lam, Karrine	11:00	end of meeting
Ms TSANG Yan-ying	11:00	end of meeting
Mr TSANG Kin-shing, Bull	11:00	end of meeting
Ms WONG Yi, Christine	11:00	end of meeting
Mr PUI Chi-lap, James	11:00	end of meeting
Dr CHIU Ka-yin, Andrew (Vice-chairman)	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHOI Chi-keung, Peter	11:00	end of meeting
Mr CHENG Tat-hung	11:00	end of meeting
Mr LAI Chi-keong, Joseph (Chairman)	11:00	end of meeting
Ms LAI Tsz-yan	11:00	end of meeting

Ms TSE Miu-yee	11:00	end of meeting
Mr NGAI Chi-ho, Derek	11:00	end of meeting
Mr SO Yat-hang	11:00	end of meeting

In Regular Attendance (Government Representatives)

Mr CHAN Sheung-man, Simon, JP	District Officer (Eastern), Eastern District Office
Miss NGAI Lai-ying, Angora	Assistant District Officer (Eastern) 1, Eastern District Office
Mr LO Cheuk-lun, Rayson	Assistant District Officer (Eastern) 2, Eastern District Office
Mr CHAO Ka-man, Stanley	Senior Liaison Officer (1), Eastern District Office
Ms WONG Sze-man, Queenie	Senior Liaison Officer (2), Eastern District Office
Mr KWAN Yu-keung	Senior Liaison Officer (3), Eastern District Office
Ms KONG Kei-kei, Hayley	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Eastern District Office

In Attendance by Invitation (Representatives from the Government and Organisations)

Mr LEE Wai-keung, Ambrose	District Leisure Manager (Eastern) (Acting), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr TONG Tung-kit, Terry	Senior Librarian (Eastern), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms LAM Sin-yee, Iris	Senior Manager (Hong Kong East), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LI Kai-hong, George	Liaison Officer-in-charge (Community Affairs)1, Eastern District Office
Ms TONG See-ming, Abigail	Liaison Officer-in-charge (Special Duties)1, Eastern District Office
Ms TANG Mei-ling, Sanny	Liaison Officer-in-charge (Special Duties)2, Eastern District Office
Ms LUK Kin-hong, Cathy	Liaison Officer-in-charge (Building Management), Eastern District Office

Secretary

Ms NG Yan-mei, Monie	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Eastern District Office
----------------------	--

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all Members and government representatives to the meeting.

Dealing with Statement

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received an oral statement from the Vice-chairman before the meeting. He said that pursuant to Order 29 of the Standing Orders of the Eastern District Council (the Standing Orders), the oral statement should not last more than two minutes. He asked the Vice-chairman to read out the oral statement.

3. The Vice-chairman read out the following oral statement:

“Co-signors: Mr Joseph LAI, Mr Andrew CHIU, Mr CHOW Cheuk-ki, Ms Alice ISHIGAMI LEE, Mr LEE Yue-shun, Mr NG Cheuk-ip, Mr HO Wai-lun, Mr KU Kwai-yiu, Mr Patrick WONG, Ms CHAU Hui-yan, Mr CHAN Wing-tai, Mr Jason CHAN, Mr KWOK Chi-chung, Ms LEUNG Wing-sze, Mr Patrick LEUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-cheong, Mr CHEUNG Chun-kit, Mr CHUI Chi-kin, Ms WEI Siu-lik, Mr James PUI, Ms Christine WONG, Mr Bull TSANG, Ms TSANG Yan-ying, Ms KARRINE FU, Mr MAK Tak-ching, Ms CHAN Po-king, Mr SO Yat-hang, Mr Derek NGAI, Ms TSE Miu-yeet, Ms LAI Tsz-yan, Mr CHENG Tat-hung and Mr Peter CHOI

The movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, having lasted for more than half a year, had been triggered since the Hong Kong Government steamrollered the Extradition Bill last year. During that period, a large number of people had lost their lives and some had lost the completeness of their bodies. Many others were still under forced disappearance or had been arrested, remanded and so on.

Nevertheless, the Hong Kong Government still turned a blind eye to the demands of the public. The Chinese Government even voiced support for the Hong Kong Government's acts, leaving police brutality unchecked and allowing the Hong Kong Government to increasingly condone the abuse of power and excessive arrests by the police. The Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) incessantly used tear gas rounds, bean

Action

bag rounds and even live rounds to hurt and brutalise the public and so on. The general public, Hong Kong's genuine major assets, had been neglected and Hong Kong had been faced with a humanitarian crisis. For instance, during the New Year's Day procession held last week, the HKPF demanded for dispersal within 45 minutes and eventually gave rise to over 400 people being rounded up in Causeway Bay. However, after being sent to the North Point Police Station, the arrestees were requested to clad identically in gray. The practice was a gross violation of fundamental human rights, in particular the presumption of innocence and the right from 'degrading treatment'. Therefore, there should be no more delay in dismissing the HKPF and reorganising the HKPF.

We have been elected into this Council by the public, so we reiterate the five demands, not one less. Hereby, we thank the Eastern District voters who supported democracy and freedom by expressing their views through their votes in the District Council Election last year, introducing 32 fellow members from the pro-democracy camp into the current term of the Eastern District Council (EDC) as the people's representatives to liberate this Council, reform the operation of this Council and enhance the transparency of this Council so as to facilitate monitoring by the public.

We, the elected Members, shouldering the huge and important responsibility of the public's expectations in this era, pledge to live up to the expectations and work side by side with members of the public. Apart from performing the functions of this Council, we Members would also continue to monitor the HKPF's law enforcement and actions in order to prevent further intimidation and assault on members of the public by unknown Mainlanders or even arbitrary accusations and indiscriminate arrests of Members. We would definitely uphold Hong Kong's core values of democracy, human rights, freedom, justice and so on, and would strive for the implementation of universal suffrage. Add oil, Hongkongers!"

4. The Chairman asked the Vice-chairman to assist in handling the motions received.
5. The Vice-chairman said that the Secretariat had received three impromptu motions before the meeting. He remarked that pursuant to Order 17 of the

Action

prevailing Standing Orders, Members who wished to move a motion could, upon the Chairman's agreement, be exempted from the requirement of giving the Secretary notice twelve clear days before the meeting. He said that the motions from Mr Bull TSANG, Mr CHENG Tat-hung and Mr CHUI Chi-kin had been received.

6. The Chairman agreed to exempt those Members from the requirement of giving the Secretary notice about the moving of motions twelve clear days before the meeting.

7. The Vice-chairman asked Mr Bull TSANG to speak on the motion.

8. Mr Bull TSANG spoke on the motion as follows:

“Motion on Objection to Pay Increase for the HKPF

Background Information

The Finance Committee (FC) of the Legislative Council (LegCo) is examining the 2019-20 civil service pay adjustment. This Council opines that the Government should handle the HKPF separately for pay purposes and should not consider an upward pay adjustment.

Since 12 June 2019, the HKPF had become the Hong Kong Government's tool to suppress protesters. The HKPF had been using unreasonable and inhumane force to suppress Hong Kong citizens. In the past six months, 3 Hong Kong citizens had been shot at a close range with live rounds by the HKPF. No less than 2 citizens and 1 foreign reporter had been shot with either rubber bullets or bean bag rounds directly in the eye by the HKPF and thus suffered serious visual impairment and even blindness. Countless citizens were covered in blood and even suffered bone fractures after being battered with hard objects such as batons by the HKPF. Chemical contamination over the territory from the excessive firing of tear gas rounds by the HKPF had endangered public health. The uncontrolled use of force by the HKPF had hurt Hong Kong citizens.

In the past six months, the HKPF had completely failed to demonstrate the required level of performance of the disciplined services but instead had humiliated Hong Kong citizens, reporters and ambulancemen with hate

Action

speech and offensive languages. The HKPF refused to comply with the legal requirement of wearing their warrant cards when on duty. Later on, the directorate of the HKPF undertook to require police officers on duty to wear and display tags with their 'operational call signs'. However, a large number of frontline police officers did not follow the instructions of the directorate by refusing to wear and display the tags with their 'operational call signs'.

Hong Kong citizens had been extremely dissatisfied with the performance of the HKPF in the past six months. A number of public opinion surveys revealed that the score of the HKPF had repeatedly recorded new lows. The HKPF indeed should not receive a pay increase.

Content of the Motion

The Eastern District Council requests the Government to face up to public opinions, take out the proposal for upward pay adjustment for the Hong Kong Police Force from the motion of '2019-20 Civil Service Pay Adjustment' to be submitted to the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council and shelve the funding application.

Mover: Mr Bull TSANG

Secunder: Mr CHUI Chi-kin"

9. The views and enquiries of various Members about the motion were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr KU Kwai-yiu said that many citizens had conveyed to him that they did not support a pay increase for the HKPF. He pointed out that in the past six months, masked police officers battered Hong Kong citizens with batons. As the police officers refused to provide their unique identification numbers, the citizens could not file complaints. He said that he had met with a number of local residents and all of them objected to a pay increase for the HKPF. He himself also objected to a pay increase for the HKPF but did not object to a pay increase for other civil servants.
- (b) Mr LEE Yue-shun agreed with the motion on objection to a pay increase for the HKPF. He opined that during the social movement in the past

Action

six months, the HKPF had not discharged their duties in a professional manner and had caused substantial adverse impacts on the community. Therefore, they should not receive a pay increase. He said that the HKPF had apparently repeated collusion and collaboration with the Mainland triad forces. He cited the Kam Ping constituency in North Point as an example to point out that numerous male Mainlanders gathered in the vicinity of Fulum Palace, Everwin Building and Metropole Building on 5 and 11 August and assaulted reporters and black-clad passers-by. Nevertheless, the police officers nearby failed to make immediate arrest. He further pointed out that in the absence of charging by protesters on King's Road in North Point, the HKPF fired tear gas rounds to disperse protesters, subjecting the community to chemical contamination and endangering public health. Therefore, he opined that the HKPF should bear the price of their brutality and should not receive a pay increase.

- (c) Ms Annie LEE said that in the past six months, the 30 000-odd police officers had always been carrying heavy equipment and making great efforts to protect the life and property of Hong Kong citizens. As the HKPF was part of the civil service framework, she opined that the HKPF should also receive a pay increase like other civil servants. She continue to say that if there were substantiated irregularities committed by individual police officers, they would also be subjected to disciplinary action. Therefore, she was against the motion.
- (d) Mr Kenny YUEN said that more detailed information and in-depth discussion would be required for him to form his views on the motion. He also suggested requesting the HKPF to the meeting to give an account of the issue.
- (e) Mr KWOK Wai-keung said that there was a need to consider a pay increase for civil servants as a whole because the Government was the employer of all civil servants and annual pay increase was among the terms of appointment for civil servants. If the civil servants in an individual department was not offered a pay increase, legal proceedings and litigation would be resulted. Besides, he opined that the imposition of obstacles on issues related to the HKPF by the camp opposing the HKPF would not help address the livelihood issues of the community.

Action

- (f) Mr CHUI Chi-kin opined that the Government could switch to a non-bundling approach and submit the proposal on pay increase for civil servants to the FC of the LegCo for scrutinisation. Besides, he said that the HKPF had always insisted that they had remained dedicated to their responsibilities, but the general public held opposite views. He opined that justice could only be done to the HKPF upon the establishment of an independent Commission of Inquiry (CoI). Subsequently, discussion could be held on the issue of pay increase for the HKPF.
- (g) Mr Bull TSANG said that in the past six months, police officers pepper sprayed pregnant women or students arbitrarily. He opined that it was a must to establish an independent CoI to stop “police brutality”, or else the HKPF would be able to escape justice.
- (h) Mr CHENG Tat-hung strongly agreed that a mechanism should be adopted to prevent rule of man. If law enforcement was conducted subject to personal preference, there would be chaos definitely. He opined that police officers battered arrestees with batons and hindered Members from asking arrestees for their names and identity card numbers truly reflected that the police officers conducted law enforcement subject to personal preference. He said that the HKPF had to conduct law enforcement in accordance with the law and that if law enforcement was conducted subject to personal preference, there would be excessive arrests. He cited the example that the HKPF suddenly terminated a procession with a Letter of No Objection issued. He opined that the HKPF had abused the power conferred by the law and had committed misconduct, so an independent inquiry was a must. In addition, he strongly agreed with a Member’s suggestion on inviting the HKPF to the meeting to give an account of the issue.
- (i) Ms CHAN Po-king said that a Member mentioned that police officers had always been carrying heavy equipment to protect Hong Kong citizens. However, she said that she had not witnessed how the HKPF protected the citizens at the scene. She recalled that during the previous lawful procession, her fellows and she marched to Luard Road in the hope of persuading police officers to remain calm but had instead been pepper sprayed without any reasons. The young and elderly protesters standing behind them had also been affected. She urged Members to attend the scene to monitor the law enforcement by the

Action

HKPF.

10. Members agreed to vote by open ballot. After voting, the following motion was passed with 32 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention.

“The Eastern District Council requests the Government to face up to public opinions, take out the proposal for upward pay adjustment for the Hong Kong Police Force from the motion of ‘2019-20 Civil Service Pay Adjustment’ to be submitted to the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council and shelve the funding application.”

Mover: Mr Bull TSANG

Secunder: Mr CHUI Chi-kin

Members voting in favour (32 members)

Mr Joseph LAI	Mr Andrew CHIU
Mr CHOW Cheuk-ki	Ms Alice ISHIGAMI LEE
Mr LEE Yue-shun	Mr NG Cheuk-ip
Mr HO Wai-lun	Mr KU Kwai-yiu
Mr Patrick WONG	Ms CHAU Hui-yan
Mr CHAN Wing-tai	Mr Jason CHAN
Mr KWOK Chi-chung	Ms LEUNG Wing-sze
Mr Patrick LEUNG	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-cheong
Mr CHEUNG Chun-kit	Mr CHUI Chi-kin
Ms WEI Siu-lik	Mr James PUI
Ms Christine WONG	Mr Bull TSANG
Ms TSANG Yan-ying	Ms Karrine FU
Mr MAK Tak-ching	Ms CHAN Po-king
Mr SO Yat-hang	Mr Derek NGAI
Ms TSE Miu-yee	Ms LAI Tsz-yan
Mr CHENG Tat-hung	Mr Peter CHOI

Members voting against (2 members)

Ms Annie LEE	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
--------------	-------------------

Member abstaining from voting (1 member)

Mr Kenny YUEN

11. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

Action

12. The Vice-chairman asked the Secretariat to send the above motion to the FC of the LegCo.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the above motion to the FC of the LegCo on 10 January 2020.)

13. The Vice-chairman asked Mr CHENG Tat-hung to speak on the motion.

14. Mr CHENG Tat-hung spoke on the motion as follows:

“Impromptu Motion

Background Information

As the Chief Executive (CE) was apathetic to Hong Kong affairs but more concerned about mainland affairs for some time in the past, it is suggested that the CE visit Wuhan in the Mainland for epidemic inspection. If no outbreak was found in Wuhan upon inspection, the CE could make public the relevant situation after returning to Hong Kong, so as to alleviate public panic and fulfill her duties as the CE. In addition, politically accountable officials, such as Teresa CHENG, Secretary for Justice, and John LEE, Secretary for Security, are very familiar with legislative amendment and immigration measures respectively. If they could accompany the CE to visit Wuhan for epidemic inspection, they might have fresh ideas in the amendment of the Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance and make improvements to the immigration measures, and enable Hong Kong people to keep updated on the virus information.

Content of the Motion

The Eastern District Council moves to request Carrie LAM, the Chief Executive to lead principal officials under the accountability system to visit Wuhan, China immediately for epidemic inspection and collection of the detailed analysis on the virus, with a view to enabling early implementation of targeted epidemic prevention in Hong Kong.

Action

Mover: Mr CHENG Tat-hung

Seconder: Ms Karrine FU”

15. The views and enquiries of various Members about the motion were summarised as follows:

- (a) Ms Karrine FU commented that as the Prohibition on Face Covering Regulation (PFCR) had been in operation and the police had taken enforcement actions against people wearing regular protective masks pursuant to the PFCR, many citizens were worried about whether they should wear masks for epidemic prevention. She believed that the Government had unshirkable responsibility in keeping the public informed of the severity of the epidemic and calling on the public to take epidemic prevention measures, instead of making filmlets to condemn Hong Kong youngsters. She said the above motion could enable the Government’s works to be reverted to the right track effectively.
- (b) Mr Bull TSANG criticised the Government for failing to provide clear guidelines on epidemic prevention, including whether the citizens who had sought consultation at private or public clinics should be quarantined. In addition, he pointed out that the HKPF might ask members of the public who were wearing masks for epidemic prevention to remove their masks or otherwise would pepper spray them due to possible dissatisfaction with their wearing of masks. He agreed with the above motion and suggested the CE and Executive Council (ExCo) members hold an ExCo meeting at Wuhan.
- (c) Mr Jason CHAN said that many Hong Kong people were insensitive to the situation of Wuhan pneumonia, instead, they only believed in reports by the mainland media. He pointed out that the information flow by mainland media or social network platform was restricted and he had learned from Weibo that a mainlander was promptly silenced because his/her family member(s) was/were suspected of contracting the Wuhan pneumonia. He agreed that the CE should be at the forefront of epidemic prevention by visiting Wuhan for inspection. In addition, he was of the view that the PFCR scared the public from wearing masks for epidemic prevention. He hoped the EDC would pass the above motion

Action

to make the Government aware that the PFCR not only violated human rights but was also an arbitrary policy.

- (d) Mr KWOK Wai-keung remarked that in the wake of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) outbreak in Hong Kong, the general public became vigilant against unknown pneumonia and had enhanced the awareness of personal hygiene. However, he said that as the World Health Organization had a reporting mechanism in place, the suggestion on CE's visit to Wuhan for epidemic inspection would not help to deal with the epidemic.
- (e) Ms CHAU Hui-yan opined that the Government should ensure the openness and transparency of the latest epidemic information, and suggested the Government timely disclose to public the virus-related information and the Government's response measures to avoid recurrence of crisis like the SARS outbreak in 2003.
- (f) Mr KU Kwai-yiu pointed out that while many citizens expressed grave concern about the epidemic in the Mainland, the Government had taken it lightly. He cited that experts had indicated earlier that the Wuhan pneumonia virus might be stronger than the SARS virus. Therefore, he hoped the Government would heighten vigilance and impose stringent measures at boundary control points (BCPs) in Hong Kong to curb the further spread of the epidemic. He indicated that as life was precious and Hong Kong was densely populated, the Government should take epidemic prevention measures as soon as possible.
- (g) Ms Annie LEE said that for the sake of public health, she suggested delegating professional doctors in Hong Kong as representatives to visit the Mainland for a better understanding of the epidemic upon the Mainland's approval. As for Members' suggestion that the CE lead her political team to visit Wuhan for epidemic inspection, she was of the view that there were still many issues in Hong Kong that the CE and her political team had to attend to and it would be more appropriate to leave the virus-related issues to doctors or professionals. She also suggested Members enhance the dissemination of messages in relation to the importance of maintaining environmental hygiene and preventing the transmission of bacteria in the community.

Action

- (h) Mr Kenny YUEN remarked that Hong Kong was probably facing the most serious health crisis after the SARS epidemic. He opined that the Government should step up quarantine measures at BCPs, prevent the entry of virus into Hong Kong, review local medical guidelines and enhance dissemination of epidemic prevention information for an effective control of the epidemic. He proceeded to point out that he supported sending relevant Government officials and medical representatives to Wuhan for site inspections, but he was also of the view that the suggestion on CE's visit to Wuhan for inspection would not help to deal with the epidemic.
- (i) Mr CHAN Wing-tai said that as an elected Member, he would comment on matters of public concern. Therefore, he was of the view that in addition to stepping up quarantine control and epidemic prevention, the Government should also visit Wuhan for epidemic inspection. He agreed that Members could express their own individual different views without imposing them on others.
- (j) Mr MAK Tak-ching opined that the CE and politically accountable officials could bring their political capabilities into play by visiting Wuhan in person for epidemic inspection in order to demonstrate their concern for the lives of Hong Kong people and mainland compatriots under the threat of the epidemic. He also cited the example that government officials and LegCo members had visited Wenchuan to understand public sentiments after the Wenchuan earthquake. Therefore, he was of the view that asking the CE and politically accountable officials to visit Wuhan for epidemic inspection would achieve the same results.
- (k) Mr CHUI Chi-kin recalled that during the SARS outbreak, Mrs Betty Tung, wife of then CE Tung Chee-hwa, had also visited the affected area in person, which gave a caring impression to the public. Therefore, he also suggested the CE and politically accountable officials follow the example.
- (l) Ms Christine WONG remarked that as a healthcare practitioner, she was always at the frontline, no matter during the SARS outbreak last time or the epidemic of Wuhan pneumonia this time. However, she had never been informed of the Government's reporting mechanism and the

Action

situation of epidemic prevention. She criticised the Government for its slow response to the epidemic and insufficient quarantine measures. She indicated that neighbouring areas such as Taiwan and Macau had deployed staff to check the temperature of passengers on flights from Wuhan before any suspected case of Wuhan pneumonia. But, on the other hand, Hong Kong had not taken relevant measures even though there were suspected cases. She opined that Government officials should visit the affected area in person as a lead to show the public its concern about the epidemic. Therefore, she supported the above motion.

- (m) The Vice-chairman also supported the above motion. He opined that asking the CE and politically accountable officials to visit Wuhan in person for epidemic inspection was not a political treatment. Rather, it aimed to highlight the emphasis of the SAR Government over the issue in order to address the community's pressing needs as the epidemic required.
- (n) The Chairman said that in the past, the leaders of China often visited the disaster-stricken areas immediately after earthquakes or floods to understand public sentiments even though they were not experts in geography or flood control. He indicated that Carrie LAM, the CE often said that she would avoid no difficult tasks. As Hong Kong people were in a panic about Wuhan pneumonia at present, the CE should uphold the spirit of "avoiding no difficult tasks" and lead politically accountable officials to visit Wuhan for epidemic inspection. He hoped the CE could "show concerns on the issue before the public does" and make her best endeavour in local quarantine control.

16. After voting, the motion was passed with 33 votes in favour, 2 against and no abstention.

"The Eastern District Council requests Carrie LAM, the Chief Executive to lead principal officials under the accountability system to visit Wuhan, China immediately for epidemic inspection and collection of the detailed analysis on the virus, with a view to enabling early implementation of targeted epidemic prevention in Hong Kong."

Action

Mover: Mr CHENG Tat-hung

Seconder: Ms Karrine FU

Members voting in favour (33 members)

Mr Joseph LAI	Mr Andrew CHIU
Mr CHOW Cheuk-ki	Ms Alice ISHIGAMI LEE
Mr LEE Yue-shun	Mr NG Cheuk-ip
Mr HO Wai-lun	Mr KU Kwai-yiu
Mr Patrick WONG	Ms CHAU Hui-yan
Mr CHAN Wing-tai	Mr Jason CHAN
Mr KWOK Chi-chung	Ms LEUNG Wing-sze
Mr Patrick LEUNG	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-cheong
Mr CHEUNG Chun-kit	Mr CHUI Chi-kin
Ms WEI Siu-lik	Mr James PUI
Ms Christine WONG	Mr Bull TSANG
Ms TSANG Yan-ying	Ms Karrine FU
Mr MAK Tak-ching	Ms CHAN Po-king
Mr SO Yat-hang	Mr Derek NGAI
Ms TSE Miu-yee	Ms LAI Tsz-yan
Mr CHENG Tat-hung	Mr Peter CHOI
Mr Kenny YUEN	

Members voting against (2 members)

Ms Annie LEE	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
--------------	-------------------

Member abstaining from voting (0 member)

17. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.
18. The Vice-chairman asked the Secretariat to send the above motion to the Chief Executive' Office (CEO) and the relevant department.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the above motion to the CEO and Food and Health Bureau on 10 January 2020.)
19. The Vice-chairman asked Mr CHUI Chi-kin to speak on the motion.

Action

20. Mr CHUI Chi-kin spoke on the motion as follows:

“Impromptu Motion

Background Information

To condemn the HKPF for indiscriminate arrests of citizens in the vicinity of Sogo Department Store in Causeway Bay, and inhumane treatment of detainees in the North Point Police Station

Article 28 of the Basic Law stipulates that ‘No Hong Kong resident shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful arrest, detention or imprisonment. Arbitrary or unlawful search of the body of any resident or deprivation or restriction of the freedom of the person shall be prohibited’.

The police had arrested about 200 persons in the vicinity of Sogo Department Store in Causeway Bay on New Year’s Day. According to newspaper reports, the operation involved indiscriminate arrests, in which many arrestees were not protesters but merely passers-by, including onlooking store staff, shoppers heading for Sogo Department Store and people wishing to leave Causeway Bay by public transportation.

Detainees at the North Point Police Station were subject to inhumane treatment, including that only blankets were distributed to them who were in the parking lot under the cold weather, no hot food was provided and no clothes were allowed to pass to the arrestees by their family members on suspicion that sharp objects might be enclosed. Finally, the arrestees were even asked to change to identical gray clothes and slippers before leaving the police station, which was like labelling the arrestees.

Content of the Motion

The Eastern District Council condemns the Hong Kong Police Force for indiscriminate arrests of citizens in the vicinity of Sogo Department Store in Causeway Bay and inhumane treatment of detainees in the North Point Police Station.

Action

Mover: Mr CHUI Chi-kin, Mr Peter CHOI, Ms LAI Tsz-yan,
Mr Bull TSANG, Mr James PUI, Ms WEI Siu-lik
Seconder: Mr KU Kwai-yiu, Ms TSE Miu-yeet, Ms TSANG
Yan-ying”

21. The views and enquiries of various Members about the motion were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr LEE Yue-shun stated that he had participated in the peaceful procession on 1 January with a Letter of No Objection issued, during which he had been injured by the police officers using batons and pepper spray. He recalled that at that time many citizens were marching in a peaceful, rational and law-binding manner, but the police officers, including anti-riot police officers, suddenly incited the mood of procession participants and stirred panic among the crowd. He had attempted to mediate but was subjected to police violence. He observed that the HKPF had recently adopted a round-up strategy to create white terror through indiscriminate arrests, which he believed was a serious violation of the freedom of speech. He also noted that there were 13 cases involving mentally incapacitated persons whose medicine taking was delayed by the HKPF during detention, resulting in aggravated conditions requiring increased dosage after they were released on bail. He was of the view that the current approach adopted by the HKPF had plunged Hong Kong into a humanitarian crisis and directly exploited the freedom of assembly and expression of the public.
- (b) Ms Annie LEE indicated that many processions eventually turned into serious violent incidents, including arson, hurling of petrol bombs and damage to “blue shops”. She was of the view that the HKPF took enforcement actions to prevent such incidents. She did not rule out that some protesters mixed with the crowd, but she was of the view that the HKPF would definitely act according to law if they confirmed that the arrestees were ordinary citizens. Therefore, she considered that before solid evidence was found, the above motion was unfair to the HKPF.
- (c) Mr CHUI Chi-kin indicated that Hong Kong adhered to the principle of “presumption of innocence”, i.e. no arrest should be made without sufficient evidence. Nevertheless, he remarked that the HKPF had

Action

recently arrested non-protesters without sufficient evidence, which had seriously undermined the rule of law in Hong Kong. He also said that the HKPF created “white terror” and had deliberately delayed the medicine taking of patients with mental illness, which aggravated their conditions. He was of the view that members of the public would make their own judgment on the police actions.

- (d) Ms WEI Siu-lik commented that on the day of the procession, she was also at the scene to assist in calling on citizens to leave, and found them very cooperative. She was of the view that it was unreasonable for the HKPF to demand all citizens to disperse within 45 minutes. She also said that there were still many citizens on the pavement at that time, but the HKPF indiscriminately arrested citizens who were unable to leave in a short time. She proceeded to indicate that the Hong Kong Bill of Rights adhered to the principle of “presumption of innocence” and questioned why the arrestees had to leave the police station in clothing similar to prison clothes after being released. She supported the above motion.
- (e) Mr Kenny YUEN asked whether the content of the motion was based on newspaper reports. He was concerned whether the content of the motion was all true. He opined that the police might certainly be condemned if it was true. However, as there were many fake news or some newspapers were biased, he was worried that the motion might be found inconsistent with the facts after passing and hoped to discuss further after concrete evidence was obtained.
- (f) Ms CHAN Po-king pointed out that the HKPF had demanded that the New Year’s Day procession be terminated at 5 pm. However, many citizens were still trapped in the Victoria Park at that time and were unable to disperse in time. Later on, the HKPF effected arrests. She said that she had attended the North Point Police Station that night to provide support for arrestees, and learned that there were citizens who had not participated in the procession but were arrested when they passed by the area after work. She once again asked elected Members to attend the scene to monitor the law enforcement actions by the HKPF so as to avoid being deceived by biased reports or fake news.
- (g) Ms TSANG Yan-ying indicated that she had also participated in the New

Action

Year's Day procession with a Letter of No Objection issued. She recalled that the organiser, Civil Human Rights Front, had announced at 5:45 pm that day that it had received the HKPF's notification requesting for the termination of the procession one minute before, and procession participants had to disperse completely at 6:15 pm. She remarked that there was an estimate of one million participants on that day and it was unreasonable for the HKPF to demand the crowd to disperse in less than 45 minutes. In addition, she was defamed for illegal assembly and intimidated by the HKPF to make her leave immediately at 6:01 pm. She was also intimidated by the HKPF to make her leave when buying drinks at Jardine's Crescent, Causeway Bay at 8 pm. She asked for the kind of power conferred by the law to the HKPF for intimidating ordinary citizens to leave when they were buying drinks. Besides, she pointed out that a Member mentioned that the procession had turned into violent incidents and "blue shops" were also damaged. However, she indicated that she had learned from the live footage that there were protesters or vandals exposed to be police officers. She asked whether the Member concerned would make a condemnation on the HKPF's disguise as vandals.

- (h) Mr Bull TSANG commented that the January 1 New Year's Day procession made him deeply understand the meaning of the Chinese idiom "畫地為牢" (to be allowed to carry out activities in a confined area). He further indicated that the number of participants of the procession on that day had reached 1.03 million. However, the HKPF not only demanded the crowd to disperse within 30 minutes but also closed some MTR station entrances/exits, making it impossible for the procession participants to disperse within a short time. Therefore, he was of the view that the HKPF's approach was unreasonable. Moreover, he said that the HKPF had detained the arrestees that day at the North Point Police Station for as long as 48 hours, and opined that the arrestees had been downtrodden by the HKPF. He hoped various parties could support the setting up of an independent CoI in the LegCo to inquire into police brutality and bring criminals to justice.
- (i) Mr James PUI remarked that on that day he had also participated in the procession with a Letter of No Objection issued. He was of the view that it was unreasonable for the HKPF to demand more than a million people to disperse within 45 minutes and accuse pedestrians on nearby

Action

streets of illegal assembly after dispersal. In addition, he remarked that he realised on that night that some of the arrestees at the North Point Police Station were not protesters, but were requested to clad in gray when leaving the police station in the absence of any legal ruling. Such labelling act was an utter violation of the principle of “presumption of innocence”.

- (j) Ms LAI Tsz-yan indicated that when she attended the North Point Police Station to support the arrestees on 3 January, she learned that there was a daughter bailing out her mother who was arrested when looking for a restaurant for dining in Causeway Bay, and an employer bailing out an employee who resided in Causeway Bay but was arrested downstairs of his/her home for failing to bring along his/her identity card. These arrestees were required to be detained for 48 hours before they were released. In addition, she indicated that a couple were also arrested for passing by Causeway Bay who were not clad in black and were simply ordinary citizens. Finally, she criticised the HKPF for refusing family members of the arrestees to provide them with warm clothing and commented that the practice was inhumane. Therefore, she supported the above motion.
- (k) Ms TSE Miu-yee commented that she learned from lawyers that some peaceful procession participants had been mentally abused and tortured by the police, and said that there was even a young person of about 13 to 14 years old who were scared to incontinence by the police at the police station. She hoped Members who had not witnessed the unscrupulous enforcement actions of the police could refrain from believing in biased reports or fake news. She supported the above motion.
- (l) Mr KWOK Wai-keung indicated that the content of the motion had neither been investigated nor corroborated by evidence, and an independent CoI had not been established, hence no conclusion could be made. He also opined that the independent CoI could not initiate prosecution after the completion of inquiry, but he remarked that he would definitely support a comprehensive review, similar to the one conducted after the 1967 Riot, to reveal the truth to the public. Finally, he opposed to the above condemnation motion.
- (m) Mr CHAN Wing-tai indicated that a Member said that the independent

Action

COI could not initiate prosecution after the completion of inquiry. He refuted that there were also people being brought to court and had been punished after the completion of independent inquiry into the collision of vessels near Lamma Island. He said that the protesters currently remanded at the Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre and Pik Uk Correctional Institution were expecting the elected Members to condemn police brutality. He also opined that 30-odd Members attending the meeting had witnessed the indiscriminate arrests by the HKPF and would not choose to believe in the biased media reports. He also hoped that people could understand that the independent COI not only serve to inquire into police, but also reveal the truth.

- (n) Ms CHAU Hui-yan stated that she was a victim of the HKPF indiscriminate arrests. She hoped Members who had not been subjected to police brutality could experience for themselves and avoid being blinded by internet rumours. She continued to indicate that it was insulting for the HKPF to force arrestees to clad in gray and reject their requests to wear their own clothes or clothes provided by their family members when leaving the police station. In addition, she mentioned that on the day of the New Year's Day procession with a Letter of No Objection issued, the HKPF had demanded more than one million procession participants to disperse within 45 minutes and closed the Electric Road, Fortress Hill after the majority of participants had left, forcing citizens to go into inner streets. She opined that the HKPF's approach was unreasonable.
- (o) Mr CHENG Tat-hung indicated that a Member said that the independent COI could not initiate prosecution after the completion of inquiry. However, he pointed out that the evidence and testimony obtained through independent inquiry could be submitted to the court. He stated that the purpose of the independent inquiry was to reveal the truth. Police officers providing untrue testimonies to the independent COI might be charged with contempt of court and criminal offences. In addition, he mentioned that the HKPF demanded that the arrestees leave the North Point Police Station cladding in gray after being released. He stated that the European Court of Human Rights had ruled that forcing non-convicted persons to appear in court in prison clothes was most likely to deliver a wrong message to the public and cause them to mistakenly believe that the subjects standing trial were guilty. The

Action

police actions' in labelling non-convicted persons was purely an insult to the arrestees.

- (p) The Vice-chairman supported the above motion as he was surprised by the police's abuse of power and indiscriminate arrests of citizens. He was of the view that it was unreasonable for the HKPF to demand a large number of procession participants disperse within a short time after the procession was terminated. He said that it was an attempt to create "white terror" for the HKPF to carry out mass indiscriminate arrests without evidence. The District Council formed by elected Members should strongly condemn the unreasonable behaviours of the HKPF.
- (q) The Chairman indicated that since the LegCo member at the meeting had not objected to the establishment of an independent CoI, he hoped that the LegCo member would unite with those belonging to the pro-establishment in urging the CE to establish an independent CoI and reflect to the LegCo the views of the EDC in relation to the establishment of an independent CoI.
- (r) Mr CHUI Chi-kin supplemented that the HKPF had arrested 287 people in the vicinity of Sogo Department Store in Causeway Bay on New Year's Day.

22. After voting, the following motion was passed with 32 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention.

"The Eastern District Council condemns the HKPF for indiscriminate arrests of citizens in the vicinity of Sogo Department Store in Causeway Bay and inhumane treatment of detainees in the North Point Police Station."

Mover: Mr CHUI Chi-kin, Mr Peter CHOI, Ms LAI Tsz-yan,
Mr Bull TSANG, Mr James PUI, Ms WEI Siu-lik

Seconder: Mr KU Kwai-yiu, Ms TSE Miu-ye, Ms TSANG
Yan-ying"

Members voting in favour (32 members)

Mr Joseph LAI

Mr Andrew CHIU

Mr CHOW Cheuk-ki

Ms Alice ISHIGAMI LEE

Action

Mr LEE Yue-shun	Mr NG Cheuk-ip
Mr HO Wai-lun	Mr KU Kwai-yiu
Mr Patrick WONG	Ms CHAU Hui-yan
Mr CHAN Wing-tai	Mr Jason CHAN
Mr KWOK Chi-chung	Ms LEUNG Wing-sze
Mr Patrick LEUNG	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-cheong
Mr CHEUNG Chun-kit	Mr CHUI Chi-kin
Ms WEI Siu-lik	Mr James PUI
Ms Christine WONG	Mr Bull TSANG
Ms TSANG Yan-ying	Ms Karrine FU
Mr MAK Tak-ching	Ms CHAN Po-king
Mr SO Yat-hang	Mr Derek NGAI
Ms TSE Miu-yee	Ms LAI Tsz-yan
Mr CHENG Tat-hung	Mr Peter CHOI

Members voting against (2 members)

Ms Annie LEE Mr KWOK Wai-keung

Member abstaining from voting (1 member)

Mr Kenny YUEN

23. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the motion to the Security Bureau and HKPF on 10 January 2020.)

24. The Vice-chairman reminded Members to declare interests where necessary in accordance with Order 48 of the Standing Orders.

I. Appointment of Secretary to the Eastern District Council

25. Pursuant to section 69 of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap. 547), the Chairman proposed and Members endorsed to appoint Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the Eastern District Office (EDO) to act as the secretary of EDC.

II. Standing Orders of the Eastern District Council

(EDC Paper No. 2/20)

26. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 2/20.
27. The Chairman asked Members to note the latest version of the Standing Orders. He also asked the Vice-chairman to assist in handling matters in relation to the discussion paper.
28. The Vice-chairman suggested reviewing the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders one by one.

Order 7(4)

“The Secretary shall prepare audio records of the proceedings of the Council, and the video records of the proceedings of the Council subject to the availability of resources and technical support. The audio records should be uploaded to the homepage of the Council except for the closed-door sessions of meetings, in which case, prior consent of the Council must be sought.”

29. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above proposed amendment were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr Bull TSANG enquired whether the video records would be made public.
- (b) Mr CHENG Tat-hung remarked that the last sentence should be “The audio and video records should be uploaded to the homepage of the Council...”.
- (c) Mr Bull TSANG suggested revising “the audio and video records” to “live broadcasts” and requested for live broadcast of meetings of EDC and its Committees. He also said that the suggestion on live broadcast could be passed to the Home Affairs Department (HAD) for follow-up actions after it was passed by the EDC. The EDC would only consider other live broadcasting approaches if the HAD did not have sufficient resources.

Action

- (d) Mr CHENG Tat-hung agreed with Mr Bull TSANG's suggestion and remarked that the wordings "live broadcasts" could be inserted between "the video records" and "of the proceedings of the Council" on the premise of the availability of resources and technical support, as the higher the transparency of an elected district council was, the better it would be.
- (e) Mr KWOK Wai-keung indicated that grammatically the wordings "and live broadcasts" could be inserted between "the video records" and "of the proceedings of the Council". However, theoretically live broadcasts could not be conducted before the preparation of the proceedings of the Council, hence he suggested considering revising the sentence to "and conduct audio live broadcasts subject to the availability of resources and technical support, and prepare video and audio records of the proceedings of the Council".
- (f) Mr Bull TSANG agreed with Mr KWOK Wai-keung's suggestion, except that it should be "video live broadcasts" but not "audio live broadcasts".
- (g) Mr Bull TSANG opined that there should be a deadline for discussing the suggestion on live broadcast and the HAD should give a reply before the next EDC meeting.
- (h) Mr KWOK Wai-keung commented that since Members would like to exert pressure on the HAD, the clause "subject to the availability of resources and technical support" should be deleted.
30. The Chairman asked the District Officer (Eastern) (DO(E)) to respond.
31. DO(E) stated that the proposed amendments would be passed to the HAD for consideration and follow-up actions after Members had reached a consensus.
32. After discussion, Order 7(4) was amended as follows:

"The Secretary shall prepare audio and video records as well as video live broadcasts of the proceedings of the Council. The audio and video records should be uploaded to the homepage of the Council except for the closed-door sessions of meetings, in which case, prior consent of the Council must be sought."

Action

Order 9

“The Council shall meet at such date, time and place as the Chairman may determine **after consulting the Vice-chairman.**”

33. Mr Bull TSANG enquired about the reasons for amending Order 9.

34. The Vice-chairman explained that in addition to regular meeting dates, he hoped to ensure the attendance of both the Chairman and the Vice-chairman at special meetings on unforeseen and urgent matters, regardless of District Council meetings or Committee meetings.

35. Mr KWOK Wai-keung was of the view that that the proposed amendment was unnecessary and might even give an impression that the Vice-chairman was on equal status with the Chairman.

36. The Vice-chairman explained that the amendment was proposed only to smoothen the administration without any other reasons.

Order 12(3)

“Members of the Council shall endeavour to attend meetings. Attendance of less than one hour would be regarded as absence (However, for meetings with an actual duration of less than one hour, attendance of the meeting should be required starting from its formal convening time to the end of meeting).”

37. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above proposed amendment were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr Patrick WONG enquired whether a 1- to 2-minute lateness to a 45-minute meeting would be regarded as absence.
- (b) Mr CHENG Tat-hung said that the provision did not cover meetings of less than one hour.
- (c) Mr Bull TSANG enquired whether a 2.5-hour lateness to a 3-hour meeting implied that attendance of the meeting was no longer required.

Action

- (d) Mr Peter CHOI commented that if meetings of less than one hour were not covered, Members might leave immediately after they had signed in and the intent of the provision would be defeated.
- (e) Mr KU Kwai-yiu suggested deleting the wordings in bracket.
- (f) Mr Kenny YUEN enquired whether the period of absence would be deducted from the total time of attendance and about the person responsible for timing if Members had to leave during the meeting for some reasons after they had signed in.
- (g) Mr MAK Tak-ching suggested that if the duration of meeting was less than one hour, the time of attendance by Members should be half of the actual meeting time.
- (h) Ms Alice ISHIGAMI LEE said she had no idea about the lateness of Members, but opined that if the seriousness of lateness resulted in the short attendance time, the attendance would be meaningless.
- (i) Mr CHEUNG Chun-kit enquired whether a 3-minute lateness to a 61-minute meeting would be regarded as absence.
- (j) Mr Derek NGAI suggested that the attendance time should be at least half of the total meeting time, whichever was shorter.
- (k) Mr Kenny YUEN commented that if the percentage of the total meeting time was used to determine the attendance of Members, he hoped the total meeting time would be clearly specified in the agenda.
- (l) Mr Bull TSANG remarked that the public would know clearly Members' attendance as long as the meeting was broadcasted live online.
- (m) Mr CHENG Tat-hung said that assuming that the duration of meeting was 5 hours, attendance of one hour was enough to address the issue.
- (n) Mr HO Wai-lun understood that the minutes of meeting in the past would show the time of arrival of Members and the end time of meeting. The enquiry of Mr Kenny YUEN was merely an operational issue which

Action

could be addressed by recording the end time of the meeting clearly under the end of meeting column.

38. After discussion, Order 12(3) was amended as follows:

“Members of the Council shall endeavour to attend meetings. Attendance of less than one hour or half of the meeting time, whichever is shorter, would be regarded as absence.”

Order 28(1)

“Unless otherwise agreed by the Chairman, Members can only speak on each issue for a maximum of three times for no more than 3 minutes in each speech with the **response time by public officers and other attendees included, and public officers and other attendees shall respond to a Member’s enquiries within a Member’s speaking time.** Public officers and other attendees can speak for no more than 10 minutes in total when briefing the meeting on the discussion papers, with conclusion time of no more than 10 minutes in total. However, the Chairman has the power to relax the time limit if situation warrants. To enhance the efficiency of meetings, public officers and other attendees by invitation shall submit written replies to the District Council’s enquiries in advance. In the matters arising, each Member can only speak once on the item with the length of time as decided by the Chairman depending on the prevailing situation.”

39. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above proposed amendment were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr CHENG Tat-hung explained that the above proposed amendment was made in the hope that representatives of government departments or other attendees could respond to Members’ enquiries immediately after the enquiries had been raised. The proposed amendment would provide flexibility in the meeting proceedings by enabling Members to determine the length of their speaking time and receive departmental response without waiting until 30-odd Members had spoken.
- (b) The Chairman said that according to the past practice of the EDC, the officers concerned would only respond after all Members had spoken. The proposed practice was the mode of meeting adopted by the LegCo.

Action

The Chairman stated that he was open to the above proposed amendment.

- (c) Mr MAK Tak-ching expressed concern that Members might not be accustomed to the mode of speaking and asked whether the Chairman had the power to make adjustments if the question-and-answer mode was not implemented smoothly.
- (d) Mr KWOK Wai-keung opined that the responses by officers in the LegCo were sometimes lengthy and it was difficult to estimate the time required. The LegCo had also tried to allow 5 minutes for each question and the reply. However, if a Member spoke for 4 odd minutes, there would be no time for departmental representative(s) to respond. He worried that there might be difficulties in putting the proposed amendment of allowing 3 minutes for each question and the reply into real practice, and suggested allowing 2 minutes for each question and 2 minutes for the reply with the reply time not longer than the question time.
- (e) Mr Patrick WONG said that according to the past practice of the EDC, if the departmental representatives only responded after 20 Members had spoken, they might miss some questions in their responses and the Chairman often had to ask again. He was of the view that the situation could be avoided by adopting the proposed amendment and Members could also allocate their 3-minute speaking time themselves. He further indicated that after the amendment, there was still a 10-minute conclusion time under the provision and officers still had to respond to Members' enquiries during the conclusion time. Therefore, he suggested passing the above proposed amendment.

40. The Vice-chairman asked Members to vote. After voting, the proposed amendment was passed with 31 votes in favour and 4 abstention.

41. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

Order 34(1)&(2)

“(1) A District Council may appoint to a committee any person who is not a member of a Council if the person satisfies the qualifications set out in section 20(1) of the District Councils Ordinance.

Action

(2) **The District Council shall determine whether to appoint to a committee any person who is not a member of a Council.”**

42. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above proposed amendment were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr Bull TSANG suggested deleting Order 34(1).
- (b) Mr MAK Tak-ching explained that since the District Councils Ordinance stipulated that a District Council may appoint to a committee any person and the person also had the right to vote, hence Order 34(1) should not be deleted, but the EDC could determine whether to appoint any co-opted member through the newly-added Order 34(2).

43. After discussion, Members passed the above proposed amendment.

44. The Vice-chairman and Members reviewed other proposed amendments and Members had no comment.

45. After discussion, Members passed the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders. The Chairman stated that the Secretariat would later distribute the latest revised version of the passed 2020-2023 Eastern District Council Standing Orders to Members and upload it to the EDC website.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the passed Standing Orders to Members on 9 January 2020.)

III. Formation of Committees and Task Groups under the Eastern District Council

(EDC Paper No. 3/20)

46. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 3/20.

47. The Vice-chairman proposed the formation of 7 Committees and 2 standing Task Groups under the new term of EDC as stated below.

- (a) Facilities Management, Culture and Leisure Committee;
- (b) Social Welfare and Elderly Committee;

Action

- (c) Traffic and Transport Committee;
- (d) Food, Environment and Hygiene Committee;
- (e) Planning, Works and Housing Committee;
- (f) Finance and Vetting Committee;
- (g) Special Committee on Monitoring Police Enforcement and Operation (SCMPEO);
- (h) Task Group on Activities for Festive Celebration and Commemoration of Important Days; and
- (i) Task Group on Community Engagement and Publicity.

48. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above agenda item were summarised as follows:

- (a) Ms Annie LEE disagreed about the formation of SCMPEO.
- (b) Mr Kenny YUEN suggested extending the coverage of SCMPEO, such as the Security Affairs Committee.
- (c) Mr CHENG Tat-hung disagreed about the extension of coverage of SCMPEO. He said that in light of the indiscriminate arrests by the HKPF in the past six months, the Committee should be properly named to focus on the police enforcement for taking follow-up actions.
- (d) Mr Bull TSANG disagreed about the extension of the coverage of SCMPEO.
- (e) Mr CHAN Wing-tai commented that a focused committee should be formed to address Members' concerns in a focused manner. He agreed that the EDC had to set up a committee that enabled the HKPF to respond in person.

49. The Vice-chairman suggested Members vote on the adoption of the names of the Committees/Task Groups to be formed as proposed in the Paper.

50. After voting, the adoption of the names of the Committees/Task Groups to be formed as proposed in the Paper was passed with 32 votes in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

51. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

Action

52. The Vice-chairman suggested Members vote on the arrangement of co-opted members.

53. After voting, it was passed with 32 votes in favour and 2 abstention that no co-opted member would be appointed during the current term of the Committees under the EDC, i.e. from the date of formation of the Committees to 31 December of the following year.

54. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

55. After discussion, Members endorsed the suggestions in Paper No. 3/20, i.e. the formation and terms of reference of 7 Committees and 2 Task Groups and related administrative arrangements.

56. The Vice-chairman enquired, as 7 Committees and 2 Task Groups had been formed, whether Members agreed to start holding the first meeting and elect the chairmen and vice-chairmen of respective Committees and Task Groups one after another later at 4 pm on the same day. Members agreed. The Vice-chairman asked the Secretariat to distribute to Members the agendas of meetings of respective Committees and Task Groups and upload them to the EDC website.

57. The Vice-chairman stated that with reference to the procedures for electing the Chairman and Vice-chairman of the EDC, he suggested the nomination period for the chairmen and vice-chairmen of respective Committees and Task Groups close one hour before the start of the first committee meeting, i.e. 3 pm, and enquired whether Members agree. Members agreed. The Vice-chairman asked the Secretariat to distribute to Members the nomination forms of respective Committees and Task Groups.

58. The Vice-chairman drew Members' attention that pursuant to section 71(3) of the District Councils Ordinance and Order 35(1) of the Standing Orders, a committee of a District Council was to elect a member of the committee who was also a member of that Council, as the chairman and vice-chairman of the committee. He asked the Secretariat to distribute to Members the forms for joining respective Committees and Task Groups, and asked Members to complete and return them to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

59. The Vice-chairman asked Members who intended to run in the election to

Action

submit the completed original nomination form to the Secretariat in person at or before 3 pm on the same day.

IV. Confirmation of the List of Government Representatives Invited to Attend the Eastern District Council's Meetings Regularly

(EDC Paper No. 4/20)

60. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 4/20.
61. Mr KU Kwai-yiu suggested including the Fire Services Department (FSD) as a government department that would attend meetings where necessary.
62. Mr CHUI Chi-kin also suggested including the Development Bureau (DEVB) as a government department that would attend meetings where necessary.
63. After discussion, Members endorsed the list of public officers in regular attendance of EDC meetings as proposed in Paper No. 4/20. Members also agreed to include the FSD and DEVB as government departments that would attend meetings where necessary.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat invited the FSD and DEVB to become government departments that would attend EDC meetings where necessary on 10 January.)

V. Financial Position of the Eastern District Council Funds and Activity Proposals

(EDC Paper No. 5/20)

64. The Vice-chairman welcomed Mr George LI, Liaison Officer-in-charge (Community Affairs)¹, Ms Abigail TONG, Liaison Officer-in-charge (Special Duties)¹, Ms Cathy LUK, Liaison Officer-in-charge (Building Management) and Ms Sanny TANG, Liaison Officer-in-charge (Special Duties)² of the EDO, Mr Ambrose LEE, District Leisure Manager (Eastern) (Acting), Mr Terry TONG, Senior Librarian (Eastern) and Ms Iris LAM, Senior Manager (Hong Kong East) of Leisure and Cultural Services Department to the EDC meeting.
65. Members declared interests as follows:

Action

Name of Member	Relationships with Relevant Organisations
Mr Bull TSANG	Adviser, The Owners Committee of Koway Court
Mr KU Kwai-yiu	Honorary Advisor, Eastern District Recreation and Sports Advancement Association Limited
Mr KWOK Wai-keung	Honorary Advisor, Eastern District Recreation and Sports Advancement Association Limited Honorary Advisor, The Hong Kong Eastern District Festival Activities Organising Committee Limited

66. The Vice-chairman said that the above declarations were made by Members who were associated with the applicant organisations/co-organiser in nominal capacities, hence they could take part in the discussion and voting for the applications concerned.

67. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 5/20.

68. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above agenda item were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr MAK Tak-ching enquired whether there was direct correlation between the bus parade under “Eastern District Year-end Fight Crime Bus Parade 2019” (Application No.: 190345) and crime-fighting. As regards “Eastern District Celebration for the 70th Anniversary of the Founding of the People’s Republic of China - Yee Wan Fun Day 2020” (Application No.: 190368), he indicated that it was year 2020 already and it was meaningless to organise an activity in celebration of the 2019 National Day.
- (b) Mr Jason CHAN indicated that the activities under Application Nos.: 190368, 190383 and 190480 held by the Area Committees were carnivals held in the name of celebrating the 70th anniversary of the founding of the People’s Republic of China in Eastern District. However, 4 months had passed since the National Day. He questioned whether those activities should continue to be held under the name. In addition, he noted that “Eastern District Spring Reception 2020” (Application No.: 190487) would be held at Fulum Palace. As there had been assaults

Action

near the venue recently, he had security concerns and hoped to understand the reasons for choosing the venue for the activity and the measures to safeguard participants' safety. In addition, he enquired about the preparation of the guest list and whether Members had any say.

- (c) Mr CHUI Chi-kin said that with regards to the Spring Reception, there was media report that Fulum Palace had not charged for the venue and the organisation was suspected of splitting of bills in applying for EDC funding. He enquired whether the amount applied for would be handled separately in that case and how it would be followed up.
- (d) Mr Bull TSANG said that Fulum Palace was located in North Point where there had been assaults. He enquired how the safety of participants would be safeguarded.
- (e) Ms CHAU Hui-yan enquired whether Members would receive the list of guests to be invited at a later stage and whether the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region would be invited. As regards the co-organisers, she enquired whether The Hong Kong Eastern District Festival Activities Organising Committee Limited had sponsored the activity and if no, whether it could be deleted as a co-organiser next time.
- (f) Mr SO Yat-hang said that the activities under Application Nos.: 190368, 190383 and 190480 were held in the name of National Day celebration but they were scheduled to be held in January 2020. He enquired why the celebrations of the National Day on 1 October were scheduled to be held in January. In addition, he indicated that the 70th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China was in 2019, so the activity name should be revised at least.
- (g) Ms Annie LEE asked attendees to take into account that some of the activities were to be held on 11 January and it was already 7 January when the meeting convened. She expected that many procedures had already completed, and additional costs might be involved if changes were to be made. She indicated that although the dates of activities were approaching, the organisations could make changes upon notification if the changes were approved.

Action

- (h) Mr Jason CHAN indicated that he was unsure about the reasons for the Area Committees to hold the celebrations for the 70th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China at that time. He assumed that there might be remaining funds in the current financial year, so activities were organised in the name of "National Day celebrations". However, he opined that it was meaningless to celebrate after the festival. He remarked that reminders should be sent to the Area Committees to pass the message or else they would continue to apply for EDC funding under other names such as New Year Carnival.

69. Ms Queenie WONG and Mr Stanley CHAO of the EDO responded to the views and enquiries of Members as follows:

- (a) As regards the bus parade under Application No.: 190345, the activity was organised by the District Fight Crime Committee (Eastern District) and co-organised by the EDO. Similar activities had also been held in the past. The main content of the activity was a bus parade to 3 locations in the Eastern District, including Oi Tung Estate, Siu Sai Wan Estate Bus Terminus and Harbour North, where the bus would stop to promote "Join Forces Against Crime" and distribute souvenirs with a view to remind the public to take winter precaution measures and disseminate related fight crime messages. The content of the activity under the funding application included the distribution of souvenirs, rental of open-top bus, a simple opening ceremony, as well as the description of the activity details. The tender exercise for the activity had been completed in accordance with internal tender procedures. The current expenditure for the activity was approximately HK\$80,000, which was lower than the HK\$111,100 then applied for. In addition, the activity was organised in accordance with established internal code of practice.
- (b) As regards Application Nos.: 190368, 190383 and 190480, there were Members enquired about the reasons for the Area Committees to hold activities in celebration of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China only in January that year. It was mainly because the funding provided by the EDO for organisations organising activities was on a financial year basis, hence the activities were allowed to be completed before early March and the requirement was the same as before.

Action

- (c) As regards the reasons for holding the Spring Reception under Application No.: 190487 at Fulum Palace, the EDO had carried out the tender exercise in accordance with established procedures. Five Chinese restaurants were invited for quotations and two Chinese restaurants had submitted their quotations, namely Fortune Harbour Restaurant and Fulum Palace. Although Fulum Palace submitted a quotation which was a bit higher, members of the Working Group considered that Fulum Palace was more accessible and occupied a larger space which made it safer for participants to move around. Besides, Fulum Palace could accommodate 75 tables, whereas Fortune Harbour Restaurant could only accommodate 33 to 55 tables, as such, members of the Working Group had finally chosen Fulum Palace as the activity venue. Concerning the security in the vicinity, participants' safety was also taken into consideration. In the past, when organising large-scale events, the EDO would invite volunteers to provide assistance when practicable, and would also liaise with relevant departments to make appropriate arrangements. As regards the list of guests to be invited, based on the reception arrangements in the past, the Spring Reception had mainly invited all EDC members, representatives from owners' corporations, Mutual Aid Committees and owners' committees, school representatives of Eastern District, and representatives of local and non-governmental organisations. The list of guests to be invited was still under preparation and was yet to be finalised. The EDO could discuss and refine the list with Members later, including the officiating guests, etc. Members were also welcome to comment on the list.
- (d) Regarding the rental and meal charge of Fulum Palace, the EDO stipulated that the rental and meal charge should be specified separately in the quotation. The rental and meal charge of Fulum Palace were HK\$56,100 and HK\$83,400 respectively.
- (e) The EDO had always attached great importance to participants' safety when co-organising activities. For activities involving a large number of people, the EDO would notify the HKPF and arrange for sufficient volunteers to assist in maintaining order during the activity. Signs indicating the locations of entrances and exits or pick-up and drop-off points for participants would also be provided. If parking was prohibited near the activity venue, the EDO would also specify it in the

Action

invitation card in an effort to excel in every detail.

- (f) Regarding the role of The Hong Kong Eastern District Festival Activities Organising Committee Limited, the reasons for choosing the organisation as a co-organiser had been stated and explained in the relevant Working Group meeting. The main reason was that the organisation was experienced in organising activities as it had organised festive celebrations on many occasions, and it also possessed extensive network and strong mobilisation power in the district. The reasons had been clearly explained in the Working Group meeting and the Working Group had endorsed the organisation to be the co-organiser of the activity.

- (g) As regards the activities under Application Nos.: 190368, 190383 and 190480 held by the Area Committees in celebration of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, due to the time required for organising the activities, the EDO could not wait until the funding approval at that meeting before starting the preparation. Also, in order to catch up with activity arrangements, some promotional materials had already been put in the post. It was hoped that Members could understand the difficulties in organising activities. The Area Committees had discussed in detail each activity and determined the date of activities. Moreover, the funding conditions also allowed the activities to be held within the financial year. Therefore, after discussion, the Area Committees had decided to hold the above activities on 11 and 12 January 2020. Due to time constraints, change to the name of the activities was no longer possible at this stage, however the EDO would enquire the Area Committees for any ways for improvement.

70. The Vice-chairman asked for Members' understanding that the funding had been approved by the last EDC term and some activities had already started preparation while some were being held. Therefore, revision could only be made as far as possible but reduction in provision was not possible. As for the Spring Reception, he opined that the list of guests to be invited could be carefully considered. He also agreed that the above message should be passed to the Area Committees.

71. The Vice-chairman concluded that Members endorsed the suggestions in the Paper and noted the content therein.

VI. Provision of the Contact Details of Eastern District Councillors to the Public

(EDC Paper No. 6/20)

72. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 6/20.

73. Members agreed with the views contained in the 3rd paragraph of the above Paper.

VII. Any Other Business

(1) Timetable for EDC and Committee Meetings in 2020

74. The Secretary stated that meetings of the EDC and its Committees were held every two months in general and would be scheduled on Tuesday afternoons as far as possible with recess in August. The Secretariat had prepared the timetable for EDC and Committee meetings in 2020 based on the above practices for Members' consideration and endorsement. The dates of Working Group meetings would be determined by the chairman of the Working Groups as necessary after consulting the vice-chairman.

75. Mr Bull TSANG suggested holding a SCMPEO meeting in February.

76. The Vice-chairman suggested discussing the meeting date at the 1st SCMPEO meeting to be held later on the same day, and asked Members to endorse the timetable tabled at the meeting first.

77. Members endorsed the above timetable.

(2) Seating Plan for EDC and Committee Meetings in 2020

78. The Secretary stated that it was the EDC's past practice to prepare the seating plan in ascending order of the number of strokes in the character of Members' Chinese surnames. The seating plan for the 1st EDC meeting of the current term would also be prepared basing on the above principle.

79. Members agreed that the seating plan should be prepared in ascending order

Action

of the number of strokes in the character of Members' Chinese surnames basing on the above principle.

80. The Vice-chairman remarked that Members could swap seats and notify the Secretariat to make arrangements accordingly.

(3) Arrangements for Setting up Ward office in Heng Fa Chuen Constituency

81. The Vice-chairman said that it was very difficult to identify a suitable location for setting up a ward office in Heng Fa Chuen Constituency, as such the last two EDC terms had endorsed and supported relevant Members in applying to the Lands Department (LandsD) for placing a container on government land for use as the ward office by way of temporary government land allocation. Ms Christine WONG, the District Council Member of the constituency concerned in the current term, had also applied to the LandsD, but the LandsD responded that policy support from the Home Affairs Bureau and EDO should be obtained before approval. In this connection, he asked whether Members would support Ms Christine WONG's application for placing a container on government land for use as the ward office by way of temporary government land allocation.

82. Ms Christine WONG thanked the Chairman and Vice-chairman for allowing her to express the difficulty in applying for the lease of a ward office. She said that as there was no suitable location for setting up a ward office in Heng Fa Chuen, she had applied to the LandsD for lease of land under short-term tenancy to place a container for use as the ward office. As the application required policy support from the EDO, she earnestly asked for policy support from the DO(E) and hoped all Members of the current term would support her application.

83. The views and enquiries of various Members about the above agenda item were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr KU Kwai-yiu said that as a Member of the last term could use a container as the ward office, he supported the application by the Member of the current term.
- (b) Mr CHENG Tat-hung absolutely agreed and supported the above application while expressing the need to condemn the LandsD or relevant departments. He indicated that in the past, the pro-establishment member concerned could use a container as the ward

Action

office. However, when the District Council Member of the constituency concerned was substituted by a pro-democracy member, the container was removed without asking whether the member of the next term would take over the lease, which was a waste of public money. He was of the view that in addition to expediting the coordination of land allocation, the LandsD or relevant departments should be condemned for demolishing the container which belonged to the elected Member.

- (c) Ms Christine WONG also agreed to condemn the LandsD. She opined that the practice was a waste of public money and time and was non-environmental friendly. The strategy of the Government was unsatisfactory.
- (d) Ms Annie LEE said that she supported Ms Christine WONG's application for continuing to use a container as the ward office in principle but did not support the condemnation of the LandsD.
- (e) Mr Kenny YUEN also supported Ms Christine WONG's application for continuing to use a container as the ward office but he had reservations about condemning the LandsD.
- (f) Mr Bull TSANG opined that as it was basically difficult to identify a suitable location for setting up a ward office in Heng Fa Chuen. He suggested that the location of the container should be reserved for Members for setting up a ward office in the long run to save the need for consultation every time.

84. DO(E) said that regarding the application of a ward office by an individual Member, all applications inevitably had to be vetted in accordance with established procedures under whatever circumstances. He believed that the relevant department would give a timely reply. Since Ms Christine WONG had already applied to the relevant department, he had no comment on the progress. Finally, he stated that the EDO had to examine a number of factors before deciding whether policy support would be given to the application.

85. The Vice-chairman concluded that all Members in attendance supported the application of the District Council Member of Heng Fa Chuen Constituency for placing a container on government land for use as the ward office by way of

Action

temporary government land allocation, and the majority of the Members also agreed that the EDC should write to condemn the LandsD. He asked the Secretariat to write to condemn the LandsD and relevant policy bureau and urged the Secretariat to follow up on the matter.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat wrote to the LandsD and DEVB on 10 January.)

VIII. Date of Next Meeting

86. The Chairman said that the first meetings of the 7 Committees and 2 Task Groups under EDC would be held one after another starting from 4 pm on the same day for the election of chairmen and vice-chairmen of Committees and Task Groups.

87. The Third EDC Meeting would be held at 2:30 pm on 3 March 2020 (Tuesday).

(Post-meeting note: The Third EDC Meeting was originally scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 3 March 2020. After consulting the Vice-chairman, the Chairman decided to reschedule the meeting to 4:30 pm on 3 March 2020.)

88. The meeting ended at 3:10 pm.

Eastern District Council Secretariat
February 2020