

(Translation)

Minutes of Follow-up Meeting of Islands District Council

Date : 30 November 2020 (Monday)
Time : 9:30 a.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Chairman

Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP

Vice-Chairman

Mr WONG Man-hon

Members

Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH	(Left at around noon)
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH	(Left at around noon)
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH	(Arrived at around 9:50 a.m.)
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken	
Mr HO Chun-fai	
Mr HO Siu-kei	
Ms WONG Chau-ping	
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy	
Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine	
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric	
Mr TSUI Sang-hung, Sammy	(Arrived at around 10:25 a.m.)
Mr FONG Lung-fei	
Ms LAU Shun-ting	
Mr LEE Ka-ho	
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho	
Mr WONG Chun-yeung	

Attendance by Invitation

Mr CHAN Hing-yin	Senior Engineer/ Projects 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr LII Kin-chiu	Engineer/ Projects 2 C, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr CHAN Chi-ching, Jason	Veterinary Officer (Cattle Management Team), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr YIP Cheuk-man	Senior Field Officer (New Development Area), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Mr CHEN Lan
Ms YUEN Ho-yan

Senior Engineer/Special Duty 1, Drainage Services Department
Engineer/Special Duty 2, Drainage Services Department

In Attendance

Ms YEUNG Wai-sum, Amy, JP
Mr LI Ho, Thomas
Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy
Mr MOK Sui-hung
Mr CHAN Yat-kin, Kaiser
Mr WONG Kwok-fai, Alfred

District Officer (Islands), Islands District Office
Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Senior Liaison Officer (1), Islands District Office
Senior Liaison Officer (2), Islands District Office
Chief Engineer/Lantau 1
Civil Engineering and Development Department
District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands,
Planning Department
District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western, Southern and
Islands), Social Welfare Department
Chief Manager/Management (Hong Kong Island and Islands),
Housing Department
District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department
Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands),
Lands Department
Chief Transport Officer/Islands, Transport Department
Acting District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent
(Islands), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Chief Leisure Manager(New Territories West),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
District Leisure Manager(Islands),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna

Ms IP Siu-ming

Ms LEE Sin-man

Mr LING Ka-fai
Mr TSANG Wai-man

Ms KWAN Ka-mun, Karen
Mr KAO Hsi-chiang

Ms LIM Ting-ting, Sylvia

Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David

Secretary

Ms Dora CHENG

Senior Executive Officer (District Council),
Islands District Office



Welcoming Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the meeting to follow up on the sixth meeting of the Islands District Council (IDC).

- XII. Question on design of Yung Shue Wan Pier Improvement Programme and request for public consultation
(Paper IDC 127/2020)
- XIX. Motion on request for public consultation on detailed design of Yung Shue Wan Pier Improvement (II) led by the Civil Engineering and Development Department
(Paper IDC 134/2020)

2. The Chairman said that agenda items XII and XIX were related to Yung Shue Wan (YSW) pier improvement and suggested that the said items be combined for discussion. Item XIX was a motion raised by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and seconded by Mr LEE Ka-ho. The Chairman welcomed Mr CHAN Hing-yin, Senior Engineer/Projects 2 and Mr LII Kin-chiu, Engineer/Projects 2 C of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) to the meeting. The written replies of the Transport Department (TD) and the CEDD in respect of item XII had been provided to Members for perusal before the meeting.

3. Mr Eric KWOK presented the question raised under item XII.

4. Mr CHAN Hing-yin added that as for community consultation, the CEDD would erect notice boards at YSW public pier detailing the pier improvement project (PIP) and consider sending the relevant information to Lamma Island residents by post.

5. Mr CHAN Lin-wai expressed his views as follows:

- (a) As for provision of a cover to the catwalk, he said that YSW public pier was built in 1960s with the uncovered catwalk the only access which was already in a state of deterioration. Request had been made to provide a cover but the department said at that time that the existing catwalk structure was not capable of supporting it. Therefore he suggested that a cover be added to the catwalk when the CEDD implemented the reconstruction project. The proposed cover was about 3.5m wide, with more or less the same function as that of the waterfront promenade of Tung Chung bus terminus. Residents generally supported the work but were concerned about the materials used and hoped that the departments concerned would apply their professional knowledge to select suitable materials and avoid damage to the environment and the landscape during work.
- (b) As for the proposal of umbrella sharing, he pointed out that the open area of the pier was exposed to wind and people had difficulty using umbrellas, and there were over ten thousand passenger trips going to and from Lamma Island per day, fearing that the umbrellas provided were unable to cope with demand. He considered the proposal as infeasible.
- (c) As for bicycle parking spaces, he agreed to Mr Eric KWOK's proposal

and hoped that the Government would identify sites on Lamma Island for bicycle parking. Upon completion of the new catwalk, the Government should tackle illegal parking of bicycles proactively. Noting that the bicycle users were not conscientious enough, Members studied with the CEDD the design of catwalk railing in order to deter illegal bicycle parking as much as possible.

- (d) He opposed the idea of launching public consultation and pointed out that during the last 12 years as a district council member, he had seen that public consultations on sewerage treatment works, helipad and bicycle parking areas, etc. were launched, but the efforts were proved futile. There were even disputes among residents due to conflicting views.

6. Ms LAU Shun-ting expressed her views as follows:

- (a) In 2008, Mr CHAN Lin-wai and the then member of Lamma Island District Office Ms YU Lai-fan had requested the departments concerned to provide a cover for the pedestrian access in YSW public pier and conducted a site visit with CEDD personnel. At a meeting of the District Facilities Management Committee in 2016, the department said that the catwalk was built in 1960s and was unable to support a cover. The proposal is therefore considered as infeasible. The Government later introduced the PIP in 2017 and YSW pier was fortunately included in the project. Eighty percent of Lamma Island residents had, for several decades, requested that a cover be provided and the then member of Lamma Island received a joint letter from around 1 000 residents in 2016 requesting the IDC to reflect their aspirations to the relevant departments. She hoped that the project would be implemented early to provide residents protection from the rain and sun when going to take a ferry.
- (b) The existing bicycle parking area had come into operation since July 2015. The then member wrote to the relevant departments in 2017 requesting the provision of a bicycle parking area on Lamma Island. At the 1 September meeting of the IDC this year, she enquired about the progress of the proposal and the department representative responded that feasibility assessment would be conducted under the PIP. She hoped that the department would apply its professional knowledge for management and law enforcement to ensure optimal utilisation of the proposed facilities.
- (c) She opined that a floating dock could pose a danger and was out-of-date. Owing to YSW pier's exposure to wind and waves occasionally, she objected to building a floating dock under the PIP.
- (d) The PIP was endorsed by the IDC in 2019. 80% of Lamma Island residents reflected to her their wishes for confirmation of the pier

design expeditiously so as to evaluate the effectiveness of the project. She urged the department to provide the work schedule rather than proceeding with a consultation.

7. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He did not object to providing a cover but would like to ask on behalf of residents whether there were any better designs or options. He opined that a democratic society, a public consultation should be conducted according to the procedures.
- (b) He requested the TD to provide the number of parking bicycles and pedestrian flow statistics at the pier during busy periods. As for Annex 2 concerning the improvement of the design of the carpark in front of the library, he asked whether the department would consider converting it into a multi-storey carpark. He reiterated that he did not object to the implementation of the project but he opined that the IDC might submit an improvement proposal having regard to the demand of residents.
- (c) The concept of umbrella sharing would encourage people to share resources with others, which he believed was conducive to improving civic consciousness.
- (d) As for consultation, to avoid disagreements between the residents and relevant departments over the cover design, he opined that a public consultation should be launched formally after the epidemic had eased and that the CEDD should provide regular maintenance for the new pier.

8. Ms Josephine TSANG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) The situation in Peng Chau was similar to that in Lamma Island, but Peng Chau pier had big trees growing nearby which could provide shelter from drizzle. She did not think that the opposition by residents of Lamma Island to providing a cover to the catwalk on the ground of blocking their view as convincing.
- (b) It could be awkwardly embarrassing when people struggled with their umbrellas during rainstorm. The departments concerned should consider the needs of the elderly, the handicapped and people with prams during a study on the construction work of the cover.
- (c) An umbrella sharing scheme was rolled out in Peng Chau but it was reported that the umbrellas provided under the scheme were all damaged and could not be used anymore. She opined that the quality of the people was the stumbling block to the implementation of such schemes.

- (d) As for bicycle parking area, it was learned that Peng Chau residents used to park bicycles at the pier. The construction of a bicycle parking area would not make any improvement to the situation. There was space available at Lamma Island pier for erecting parking racks. Looking at the situation in Peng Chau, only people not going to work would place their bicycles on the racks. She opined that there was a need to instill in residents a culture to address illegal bicycle parking.
- (e) Only 400-600 residents participated in the opinion survey, which failed to represent all residents of Lamma Island. The proposal for providing a cover to the catwalk had been under discussion for a long time but the implementation of it was difficult due to geographical constraints. As residents of Islands District, Members agreed that there was a need to construct a cover.

9. Ms WONG Chau-ping expressed her views as follows:

- (a) The residents of Lamma Island had strived for constructing a cover for the catwalk for half a century. The work would have more pros than cons. After completion of the cover, residents would not get wet when coming out of public toilets or restaurants to reach the pier.
- (b) As for umbrella sharing, she said that the open space outside Ha Leng Pei Tsuen, Tung Chung was packed with a large number of abandoned shared bicycles and the site was later handed over to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for construction of leisure facilities. She appreciated the concept of umbrella sharing but doubted its efficacy. She opined that one should not judge the quality of residents solely on the basis of the scheme.

10. Mr Ken WONG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The project had been discussed for some time and was endorsed by the IDC. If it was raised for discussion every time a Member or resident came up with a new idea, there would be no end to it. He opined that a clear line should be drawn.
- (b) Objections had been raised to the proposal for building additional bicycle parking spaces on Lamma Island but the parking area was packed with bicycles upon its completion, showing that residents have a certain demand for parking spaces. He thought the widening of the catwalk for accommodating bicycles might not be infeasible. However, if installation of piles in seabed was involved, gazetting would be required under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance and he expected it would take around 10 years before commencement of work.

- (c) He considered efficiency important and that endorsed projects should not be overturned in the face of oppositions from a group of people. To take the cover of Central Piers as an example. The outlook of the cover might not be appealing but it had served its purpose. He suggested the relevant departments to submit the design of the proposed cover for Members' comments to avoid further delay.

11. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Members had drawn an analogy between shared bicycles and shared umbrellas and to the covers of Central Piers and the catwalk of the pier on Lamma Island. He did not think they were comparable and hoped that Members could support their views with relevant examples.
- (b) He said that Members raised questions and motions so as to know more details of the improvement of YSW pier and to urge the TD to conduct a formal public consultation. Yet some Members had misinterpreted it as opposing the construction of the cover. He pointed out that an opinion survey with just more than 600 participants was not representative enough. He understood that Members of the constituency wanted the project to be implemented as early as possible, but launching public consultations was the only way the departments could genuinely gauge people's views.
- (c) He had conducted site visits for the project but was not as familiar with Lamma Island as the three members of the constituency. The government officers were not residents either and not clear about the situation. It was necessary to conduct a public consultation.
- (d) Mr CHAN Lin-wai said just now that public consultations always led to conflicts and Mr Ken WONG said that there were objections every time a project was proposed. He considered that in a democratic and free society, it was normal for disagreements to arise, but what mattered was how a consensus was reached ultimately.

12. Mr CHAN Hing-yin gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The department noted that Members were concerned about the safety of floating platform. The consultants and the department had sent their staff to visit the piers with floating platform overseas and reviewed the relevant design guidelines, and considered the design of floating platform is technically feasible. The floating platform and gangways were designed to fit the use of wheelchairs and prams. One of the two berths would be selected for building a floating platform and connected to the pier with suitable gradient. The floating platform would maintain a constant freeboard at high and low tides, which provided a safe access for the wheelchair users. Appropriate facilities would also be provided for the safety of users.

- (b) Regarding the implementation timetable, the department had stated at a meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee in 2019 that the construction works were anticipated to commence in 2022.
- (c) Members' opinions on umbrella sharing are noted and the department would explore with the consultants the feasibility of the proposal. He opined that umbrella sharing was not on a par with the provision of cover for the catwalk. Wheelchair users and people with prams could not use umbrellas while operating the wheelchairs and prams manually, but a cover would offer them protection from the sun and rain along the catwalk to the main street on Lamma Island.
- (d) Regarding public consultation, information about the design concept would be sent to residents by post. Where epidemic situation permitted, an on-site discussion forum would be conducted to solicit residents' opinions and respond the enquiries. The department added that the proposed catwalk would be around 8 metres wide with the proposed cover around 3.5 metres wide.

13. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho understood that the CEDD was unable to hold an on-site public consultation forum due to the epidemic. Even when it was held, there would be restrictions on the number of participants. Many Members hoped that the PIP could commence early. As the epidemic had persisted for about a year, he opined that the Government might change the public consultation method, e.g. holding a series of public consultations in the villages of Lamma Island in a smaller scale to collect the views of pier users.

14. Mr HO Chun-fai said that DC Members were recognised representatives of the people and the motions or questions they raised at the meetings represented the aspirations of people. He considered that public consultations should be conducted on issues with extensive impacts (e.g. construction of power stations on Lamma Island). He opined that provision of a cover to the catwalk could provide shelter from the storm and rain and would gain public support, so there was no need to entangle the issue at the meeting.

15. Mr CHAN Hing-yin said that Members' views would be considered but he tentatively hoped that an on-site consultation of a bigger scale could be held to allow more residents of Lamma Island to participate. He hoped that Members would understand that there would be difficulties in venue booking due to the epidemic.

16. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho presented the motion under item XIX.

17. Mr CHAN Lin-wai said that according to Points 1 and 5 of the motion, a signature campaign was held between 7 and 10 March 2016 by the Lamma Island (North) Rural Committee (RC) in support of provision of a cover to the YSW pier, Lamma Island and the civil organisations/bodies were consulted on the proposal in mid-August this year, neither findings were released. He asked Mr LEUNG

Kwok-ho to give a detailed explanation.

18. The Chairman requested Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho to present the motion again briefly.

19. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho asked the Chairman whether he was to read out the motion.

20. The Chairman said that Member raising a motion could decide which part(s) of the motion he was going to introduce. As Mr CHAN Lin-wai made an enquiry regarding Parts 1 and 5 of the motion, Mr LEUNG could choose whether he should respond to the background information of the motion.

21. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that Members had read the relevant papers before the meeting, so there was no need for him to respond. He said that Members and the general public hoped that the matter would be dealt with quickly and the department concerned promised to consider proactively the launching of a public consultation. He hoped that the IDC would take a vote on the motion.

22. Mr Ken WONG said that the CEDD anticipated that the work would commence in 2022, so the work progress should not be hampered by public consultation. He proposed that the phrase “and work will commence in 2022 as scheduled” be inserted at the end of the motion to avoid any delay.

23. Mr CHAN Lin-wai did not understand why it was mentioned in the background of the motion that the RC had not released the survey findings. He hoped that Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho would give an explanation.

24. The Chairman requested Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho to explain Points 1 and 5 of the motion’s background.

25. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that as revealed by the residents of Lamma Island, the signature campaign and the opinion survey were held on 7 March 2016 and in mid-August this year respectively but the findings were not yet released. He hoped that the government departments would obtain the findings from the RC when launching the consultation for comparing with the findings of other organisations.

26. The Chairman asked Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho about his opinions on the amendment made by Mr Ken WONG.

27. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho understood that it would be difficult to pick up the pace of opinion survey amid the epidemic. He was afraid that other questions or motions would arise after a vote was taken on the motion. Therefore, he did not think that it was appropriate to set the date for commencement of work at the moment and did not agree to the amendment made by Mr Ken WONG.

28. Mr HO Chun-fai opined that there was no need to conduct an opinion survey every time the number of stakeholders increased as residents were in general

supportive of the implementation of the project.

29. Ms Josephine TSANG opined that the launching of opinion surveys should not obstruct work progress and that there was no need to conduct a large-scale opinion survey. She suggested that livelihood-related projects should be completed as soon as possible and if opinion surveys were conducted on Lamma Island, they should be made mandatory for all residents to participate.

30. Mr CHAN Lin-wai, in the capacity as a member of the RC, explained Points 1 and 5 of the background of the motion. He explained that the RC was composed of village representatives and the chairman was selected from among village representatives. Resident representatives had their seats starting from 2003. Residents with three years of residency would have voting right; and with six years of residency could vie for a seat, hence creating a mandate. From time to time, the RC maintained communication with government departments on district administration and informed residents of details of the discussions. There was a high level of transparency without the need to ask for the IDC to pass their views on to government departments.

31. Mr FONG Lung-fei opined that Members might propose to amend the motion without going to discuss the background if they wished.

32. Mr Eric KWOK opined that Members should vote on the motion according to the procedures and that public consultation would facilitate work progress and help avoid any conflicts after work commencement. The government departments should get prepared beforehand while residents should be given the opportunities to express opinions.

33. Ms Amy YUNG said that the Chairman had reminded Members before the start of the meeting to speak concisely. She opined that there was no need to give an account of the background, and asked the Chairman to follow the rules when presiding over the meeting.

34. Mr FONG Lung-fei thought the Chairman should not interrupt his speech just now.

35. The Chairman said that the Secretariat would invite guests to the meeting to respond to the questions but not the motions raised. Members would be asked to vote on the motions. Since Members might not be clear about the contents of the motions or have different interpretation of the motions, they could request the movers to explain or raise questions relating to the motions. Although much time might be spent, Members should be provided with sufficient information before voting. He had said that time was tight, but flexibility should be given. It was hoped that Members would have enough time to speak.

36. Members voted by a show of hands, and the result was 7 votes in favour, 11 against and no abstention. The motion was not passed.

(Members voted in favour included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Members objected included: The Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms LAU Shun-ting.)

(Mr CHAN Lin-wai and Mr Sammy TSUI joined the meeting at around 9:50 a.m. and 10:25 a.m. respectively.)

XIII. Question on refusal of the application from Lung Ngam Monastery in Tai O for issue of private columbarium licence

(Paper IDC 128/2020)

37. The Chairman said that the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had provided a written reply for Members' perusal.

38. Mr HO Siu-kei briefly presented the question.

39. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang responded that the Private Columbaria Affairs Office of the FEHD had provided a written reply to the IDC on the matter, and he had nothing to add at the moment.

40. Mr HO Siu-kei said that he had nothing to add.

41. The Chairman said that he and Mr HO had raised the question together, hoping that Members would pay attention to the situation. He pointed out that the Lung Ngam Monastery was probably the only non-profit-making private columbarium in Hong Kong. It had provided service ever since cremation began to be accepted by some Tai O residents. The decision to build the premises was made within a short time, and the funding mainly came through donations from the users. The charge from the initial \$1,000 to \$2,000 to the current \$3,000 was a far cry from the charges of commercial columbaria. If the Lung Ngam Monastery failed to obtain a licence, the cremains that mainly belonged to 1 700 families from Tai O would need to be relocated elsewhere. He said that the temple within the premises was run by a small group which did not have the capacity and might not even meet the requirements for the application of a licence, so he hoped that the FEHD would exercise flexibility in handling the case. He asked the District Officer (DO) to pay attention to it and provide assistance in the appeal and licence application.

42. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Tai O residents supported the Lung Ngam Monastery in continuing its operation of the columbarium. He said that the person in charge of the monastery, Mr NG, was over 80 and incapable of preparing all the information required during the application process. He hoped that the

FEHD would exercise discretion and asked the Islands District Office (IsDO) and the Tai O Rural Committee (RC) to provide assistance on the licensing matter so that half of the Lung Ngam Monastery could continue to be used for interring cremains.

- (b) He said that the licence applicant, Mr NG, had all along complied with the legislative requirements and had stopped trading in niches since 18 June 2014. At present, there were two buildings in the Lung Ngam Monastery used for keeping cremains. One of them had been in operation since the 1980s, and the other still had not been in use. According to the Tai O Fringe Outline Zoning Plan S/I-TOF/2, the Town Planning Board (TPB) designated the Tai O Fringe area as development permission area on 1 December 2009. As the said building had been used by the Lung Ngam Monastery to keep cremains since the 1980s, such use was considered an existing use, which meant that it was approved by the TPB.
- (c) Mr NG was aware of the matter regarding the temporary suspension of liability (TSOL) application, but he was incapable of handling the application and the large amount of information required by himself due to his age. Mr KWOK therefore hoped that the IsDO and the Tai O RC would provide assistance to Mr NG, who hoped that the niches containing cremains would not be affected during the application process and that the FEHD would exercise its discretion to grant a TSOL if the application was in compliance with planning and lease requirements.

43. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the niches in the Lung Ngam Monastery were very old and simple, reflecting the residents' lifestyle at the time. Given the old age of the person in charge, she hoped that the departments concerned would provide as much assistance as possible in different aspects, such as the management and handling of documents.

44. The Chairman said that when columbaria were first regulated, the Lung Ngam Monastery was on List A and thus an exempted premises. Its subsequent application failed mainly because there was no one to provide assistance and professional advice. He therefore identified a voluntary professional to help with the documents, hoping that the appeal would go smooth. He and Mr HO Siu-kei would accompany the person in charge to help explain the actual situation to the Appeal Board. If the appeal was approved, they would resubmit the application, hoping that the matter would be resolved satisfactorily by then.

XIV. Question on a case of residents being hit by buffaloes in Pui O (Paper IDC 129/2020)

45. The Chairman welcomed Mr CHAN Chi-ching, Jason, Veterinary Officer (Cattle Management Team) and Mr YIP Cheuk-man, Senior Field Officer (New

Development) of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) to the meeting to respond to the question.

46. Mr HO Chun-fai briefly presented the question.

47. Mr Jason Chan said that the incident took place on 26 September. The AFCD received a complaint on 28 September that Auntie Chen was struck and injured in a fight between two buffaloes in Ham Tin Tsuen, Pui O. The AFCD sent its staff, including Mr Jason Chan himself, to attend the scene the following day. One of the male buffaloes involved was found and sterilised. It was now kept in a government farm. If its temperament improved, the AFCD would consider releasing it to a suitable place.

48. Mr Eric KWOK said that he lived in Pui O. He commenced investigation after receiving the question last month. He opined that the AFCD should conduct an in-depth investigation. The two buffaloes were in fact not fighting, and Auntie Chen also said that they were chasing around but not fighting, so he hoped that the Chairman and Mr HO Chun-fai would delete the word “fighting”. He opined that the AFCD castrated the buffalo without scientific grounds and an in-depth investigation. According to the video provided by Ms Jean LEUNG, also known as “Buffalo mama”, the vet cut open the buffalo’s testicles and simply glued the wound closed. Ms LEUNG looked after the castrated buffalo for an entire week. Based on the principle of “Development in the North, Conservation for the South” under the Sustainable Lantau Blueprint promulgated by the Government, buffaloes were a part of the South Lantau habitat and should therefore be protected. It saddened him that a brown mother cow and its calf were killed by a car on a road section in Cheung Sha South, Lantau on 1 October; and from 15 to 27 October, brown cattle and buffaloes were intentionally injured by sharps one after another in Mui Wo. He said that he had made a report to the police and asked whether the AFCD had investigated and taken follow up action. He hoped that the police would follow up the animal abuse cases in a serious manner in accordance with the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Ordinance (Cap. 169).

49. Mr HO Chun-fai said that residents of South Lantau loved bovines, but there were too many of them, and they often repelled each other and got into fights easily. Regarding Mr Eric KWOK’s views, he believed that the buffaloes accidentally hit the resident when they were fighting. He said that the AFCD had castrated the buffalo as a punishment and would euthanise it if necessary. Villagers cherished bovines in general, but there were just too many of them. He proposed that the AFCD should take action whenever there were more than 50 buffaloes, rather than euthanising them all. He hoped to break the impasse with the environmentalists and bovine lovers. Recently, bovines intruded into farmlands repeatedly to search for food. Residents wanted to protect their crops, but environmentalists reported to the police that the fences on the farmlands blocked the bovines from leaving. He hoped that the departments concerned would discuss with the bovine lovers to find solutions.

50. Mr FONG Lung-fei puzzled that the AFCD performed castration simply

because the two buffaloes had a fight, and he asked whether people had to be castrated for fighting on the street. He said that the AFCD was responsible for conserving the nature and should find ways to keep the bovines in captivity or identify a habitat for them. He pointed out that Lantau residents used to farm for a living, and bovines made good companions for humans. The AFCD should find ways to resolve the conflicts between bovines and humans in the community. He opined that the Government could designate lands as habitats for bovines and plant diverse vegetation for their survival, instead of castrating them at will.

51. Mr WONG Chun-yeung also hoped that humans could coexist with animals and suggested the AFCD consider establishing a buffalo centre in Mui Wo to help channel people's negative emotions caused by the large-scale protests in the past and prevent the bovine issue from causing further conflicts. He proposed allocating resources to set up offices near bus stops in Mui Wo, Tai O, Shui Hau or Pui O because animal lovers or environmental groups had to solve the problems of cats and dogs in addition to bovines. He hoped that the development projects under the Lantau Tomorrow Vision would accommodate Lantau Island's characteristic of "urban-rural symbiosis". Buffaloes were always seen on the North Lantau Highway in the past, and they could only be found within Lantau Island nowadays. He opined that the Government should consider establishing and managing an animal organisation or centre on Lantau Island so that the IDC would not have to discuss animal issues every few years or receive petition letters from relevant groups.

52. Mr Sammy TSUI said that bovines had a long history on Lantau Island and that residents from outside the area would come to visit them. He did not understand why the Government or the AFCD had not formulated any policies to support the bovines in South Lantau, which led to many problems (such as cattle being harmed etc.). The police would take action if they found out that cats or dogs were abused. The Government, the AFCD or the police did not condemn the acts of cruelty towards the bovines in South Lantau, even though they were seriously harmed. He asked if the AFCD would subdue bovines with aggressive means to capture them, or follow overseas experts' practice of performing castration by extracting organs with bare hands without anaesthetic, thereby inflicting pain on the bovines or resulting in death from infection. He hoped that the AFCD would formulate a policy to manage bovines and hire cowherds to look after them in captivity within designated sites, keeping them away from residential areas.

53. Mr LEE Ka-ho said it was heart-wrenching to see Auntie Chen's injuries in the photo. He agreed that bovines in South Lantau should be regulated. However, at present, the AFCD controlled their population solely by capturing, detaining and castrating them, which was improper and inhumane. As Hong Kong lacked a comprehensive law on animal protection, animal protection regulations should be enacted, in addition to the establishment of a buffalo centre for conservation proposed by Mr WONG Chun-yeung. The animal protection regulations of Hong Kong had been in force since enactment in 1930. The legislative intent was not to protect animals but mainly to consider animals as private property. For instance, if an owned cow was hit by a vehicle, property issues would be involved. He hoped that the Chairman would, in the name of the IDC, convey the need to enact animal

protection legislations to the Government as soon as possible. Otherwise, the IDC would continue to have endless discussions on issues of cats and dogs in urban Tung Chung or bovines in rural area.

54. Mr Ken WONG enquired whether the AFCD would formulate comprehensive policies to deal with the problems of stray bovines, such as cases where bovines were hit by vehicles or attacked by people. There had been an increasing number of cases where bovines attacked people. Although the AFCD said it would take action, it had not brought forward any new proposals. He said that there was already a policy in place to manage stray dogs, even though dogs were smaller in size and unlikely to attack people. By contrast, bovines were easily affected by external factors and might charge towards people suddenly. The local community had raised the issue with the AFCD multiple times, but it had not implemented any policies to manage stray bovines or devoted any resources to address the problem. As a result, nuisance was caused to residents by bovines from time to time.

55. Mr WONG Chun-yeung recalled that at the beginning of an IDC meeting, Members had mentioned the Project Lantau Eyes of the Hong Kong Police Force, which used closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras to prevent theft. He said that there was much concern about whether humans and animals could coexist, but Chairman YU and Mr HO would give the impression that humans and animals could not coexist by raising such a sloppy and erroneous question. He asked whether Auntie Chen's CCTV camera had captured what happened at that time, or whether anyone could tell from the CCTV footage who was right and who was wrong. Lantau Island lacked ancillary facilities, yet what all Members did was asking the AFCD to give a response. This inevitably made Lantau residents think that Members only made a perfunctory effort and that Project Lantau Eyes was not as effective as intended.

56. The Chairman said that the scene of the accident was not close to residential areas, so it was not within the scope of Project Lantau Eyes.

57. Ms WONG Chau-ping disagreed with Mr WONG Chun-yeung's remark that Mr HO's question was sloppy. Since Members took office on 1 April last year, every discussion on bovine issues, whether at the meetings of the IDC, other committees or even the RCs, arrived at the same answer. She considered the sterilisation method adopted by the AFCD inhumane. Also, it was impossible for cowherds to watch over the bovines on South Lantau Road or in other areas of Lantau Island around the clock for keeping them from running onto the road. She opined that Project Lantau Eyes was useful only for facilitating subsequent investigation into what happened. She wondered why the incident could not be avoided and suggested it should be handled by a dedicated department.

58. Mr FONG Lung-fei proposed "revitalising" the cattle by using them to farm government lands, so as to reduce their energy for fighting. This would also allow the development of ecotourism and create employment opportunities. He pointed out that there were many government lands available for cultivation and rehabilitation

on Lantau Island. Farming could increase the working population and promote the development of tourism; cattle could also rest in cowsheds instead of roaming around. The cattle could be managed by cowherds in daytime and rest in cowsheds at night. The proposal would allow the area to be self-sufficient in food without government subsidies and foster the area's economic development. He proposed employing the elderly farmer households near Yat Tung Estate to look after the cattle so that they could earn their living.

59. Mr HO Chun-fai said that the AFCD refused to accept the proposal and considered it unfeasible. More than a decade ago, the problem did not exist because there were not too many bovines. Even though nowadays there were more bovines fighting for territory and food, the AFCD had no intention to relocate them. He requested the AFCD to provide the actual data, say, for example, if the number of bovines exceeded 60, the bovines in surplus should be sent to slaughterhouse, but the AFCD replied that it did not maintain statistics on such information. He said that residents of Pui O and South Lantau did not hate animals, but there were too many bovines causing nuisance. He opined that advice should be given to the public to refrain from feeding bovines on the roadside, so as to prevent them from getting used to graze on the roadside at 4 or 5 in the afternoon and causing problems.

60. The Chairman said that as some Members had other commitments in the afternoon, he hoped to invite four more Members to speak so that the AFCD could then give a consolidated response. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho's impromptu motion would be dealt with before lunch break.

61. Mr WONG Chun-yeung said that he was not criticising Mr HO Chun-fai for being sloppy, but he considered that the document was unclear. Moreover, Mr Eric KWOK said at the beginning that the accounts given by Auntie Chen and her domestic helper were different from that by Mr HO. It was why he proposed finding out the truth through Project Lantau Eyes. He said that if a similar incident occurred on Lantau Island in future, in addition to requesting the AFCD to attend the meeting, Members would have to discuss and express their views to the AFCD. He opined that Members had to learn the full picture of the incident before they could discuss it at the meeting. He hoped that Mr HO would respond to the discrepancies between the accounts given by Auntie Chen and him.

62. Mr HO Siu-kei said that there had been several cases of conflict between humans and bovines so far this year, including a cow being killed by a car in Cheung Sha and some others being attacked in Mui Wo. He said that it was futile for Members to express their views unfortunately as the AFCD still had not come up with any solutions. He proposed that Members should set up a task force with bovine lovers and the local community on stray bovines on Lantau Island and urged the AFCD to address the incident properly to prevent future recurrence. He as a DC member of the district felt ashamed of the lack of progress and hoped that the Chairman and all stakeholders could have an earnest discussion. He opined that public officers ought to have a sense of mission, rather than getting paid just for facing Members' accusations at meetings.

63. Ms WONG Chau-ping was saddened by the sight of bovines eating food left behind by tourists and raiding cardboards in garbage in public areas. The AFCD representatives said at a meeting that insurance companies would not compensate drivers for accidents caused by cattle running off the road. She opined that the relevant departments should give an explanation about that.

64. Mr Eric KWOK asked the AFCD to give a response and agreed with Mr HO Siu-kei's view on forming a task force to follow up on the issue and contact local concern groups. He also agreed with Mr LEE Ka-ho's proposal of asking the Government to enact animal protection law. He hoped that the AFCD as the responsible department would introduce the bill into the Legislative Council as soon as possible to ensure that animals were respected and protected. He estimated that there were about 300 head of bovines on Lantau Island and asked whether the amount was too large as compared to the 7.8 million population of Hong Kong, or whether the Government was shirking its responsibilities and disregarding animal rights. Members always raised questions about environmental capacity to government departments, especially the AFCD. According to the information provided by "Buffalo mama", almost 99% of the bovines were sterilised. Buffaloes and brown cattle in South Lantau should be protected and respected pursuant to the Sustainable Lantau Blueprint. The AFCD was responsible for fostering harmony between humans and bovines and taking into account the environmental capacity before performing sterilisation. It was entirely humans' fault that the bovines were on the brink of extinction as almost 99% of them were sterilised. He pointed out that there were many wetlands and abandoned private farmlands in South Lantau, so he did not understand why the Government could not use the Environment and Conservation Fund to acquire lands from owners and farmers at market value for conservation and turn Lantau Island into something like a national park to promote tourism. The question lay with whether the Government had a sense of mission to protect the last remaining brown cattle and buffaloes in Hong Kong.

65. Mr Jason CHAN made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the incident of an old lady being hit by a buffalo on 26 September, the AFCD contacted the local representatives, villagers and "Buffalo mama" before attending the scene on 29 September. "Buffalo mama" said that the buffalo involved was a newcomer that did not belong to the group and wanted to fight for territory. She also thought that the new buffalo should be removed or even sterilised.
- (b) Regarding the issue of cattle sterilisation raised by Mr Eric KWOK, foreign farms often suffered losses from putting unsterilized male cattle together, because they would get injured in fights and become unfit for sale. He said that the rationale behind the AFCD's consideration was that sterilisation was a common way to keep cattle's emotions in check.
- (c) As for whether the buffaloes were fighting or chasing around, he opined that the safety of human life should be a priority concern.

- (d) Regarding the case of bovines being injured in Mui Wo mentioned by Mr Erick KWOK and Mr Sammy TSUI, the AFCD staff went to Mui Wo to treat the wounded bovines with villagers and “Buffalo mama” last Monday. He said that a bull and another cow had big wounds near their genitals, but he was not sure if the wounds were inflicted by sharps. The incident was handed over to the police, and the AFCD staff would conduct an inspection on Lantau Island the following day.
- (e) As for the policy, the AFCD carried out a bovine population survey in 2013. There were about 80 to 90 buffaloes on Lantau Island at that time, and the number increased to 130 to 140 in 2018.
- (f) He said that the more bovines there were, the greater conflicts with humans they would have. The AFCD did not perform sterilisation for buffaloes on a large scale before, but later it considered necessary to control their number through sterilisation and thus began to do so since 2019. He said that the number of bovines that had undergone sterilisation was not 99%. The aim of sterilisation was to control their number, not to exterminate them. The AFCD simply hoped that the number of bovines could be limited to a lower level and that they could coexist with humans.
- (g) He pointed out that there would still be calves born in the days to come, but not too many in number. Although the AFCD controlled the number of bovines through sterilisation, the sterilised bovines would still exist. Hence, their number would not drop suddenly, though their birth rate would be lower.
- (h) The AFCD noted the villagers’ proposals of relocating the bovines to Tai A Chau to lower their number on Lantau Island, and keeping them in captivity to prevent them from straying onto the road.
- (i) The AFCD consulted villagers and tourists about relocating the bovines to Tai A Chau. It eventually decided to place the plan on hold and announced the decision at the Lantau Area Committee meeting in February this year. The announcement was recorded in the minutes of meeting.
- (j) At the said meeting, some villagers and animal lovers proposed keeping the bovines in captivity to reduce their appearance in public places. However, since bovines were wild animals, keeping them in captivity would go against the AFCD’s policy. He opined that wild animals should live freely in the nature.
- (k) Regarding Mr WONG’s proposal of establishing a new animal centre, the AFCD had set up four animal management centres as well as the Cattle Management Team comprising 11 members responsible for bovine management across the territory. He said that he would relay

Members' views to his superiors.

- (1) Regarding the animal protection law that some Members mentioned, the AFCD had completed the consultation on the provisions of Cap. 169, which would be amended to meet the changes and needs of the society.

66. The Chairman thanked the AFCD for the response. He understood that Members were concerned about the bovines' welfare and people's safety. To avoid creating conflicts, the IDC would request in writing that the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation meet with Members, bovine protection groups and the victim. He would arrange a special meeting first, but as for the setting up of a task force, it would be decided after the special meeting. He hoped that the AFCD would reconsider the proposals of relocating the bovines to Tai A Chau, Mui Wo or other places, and that a large-scale meeting could be arranged to discuss the matter in detail after the epidemic subsided.

(Mr CHOW Yuk-tong and Mr YUNG Chi-ming left the meeting at around 12 noon.)

XVIII. Question on Lantau Tomorrow Vision (Paper IDC 133/2020)

67. The Chairman said that the impromptu motion was moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and seconded by Mr WONG Chun-yeung.

68. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho presented the motion: "The Lantau Tomorrow Vision will cost huge sums of public money and the proposed artificial islands will increase traffic pressure tremendously on the outlying islands. The Government has apparently not given thorough consideration to the impacts on Islands District and has made no arrangement for discussion in the IDC, showing a lack of respect for local residents. This Council opposes the Government's funding application to the Legislative Council for advance works studies for the Lantau Tomorrow Vision."

69. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that "for discussion" should be added after "The Government...has made no arrangement".

70. The Chairman approved the addition of "for discussion" after "The Government... has made no arrangement" for clarity.

71. The Chairman asked if any amendments to the motion were proposed.

72. No amendments to the motion were proposed. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on the impromptu motion. The voting result was 7 votes in favour, 9 votes against and one abstention. The impromptu motion was vetoed.

(Members voted in favour included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy

TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Members voted against included: The Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Mr Ken WONG abstained.) (Ms Josephine TSANG left the meeting temporarily.)

XV. Question on progress of study on Outlying Islands Sewerage Stage 2–Lamma Village Sewerage Phase 2 Package 2
(Paper IDC 130/2020)

73. The Chairman welcomed Mr CHEN Lan, Senior Engineer/Special Duty 1 and Ms YUEN Ho-yan, Engineer/Special Duty 2 of the Drainage Services Department (DSD) to the meeting to respond to the question. The DSD had provided a written reply for Members' perusal.

74. Ms LAU Shun-ting said that the Director of Drainage Services had responded to her question at the IDC meeting on 19 October 2020 and she was satisfied with the response.

XVI. Question on impact on health of residents after completion of base station in Ying Tung Estate
(Paper IDC 131/2020)

75. The Chairman said that the written replies of the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA), Hong Kong Telecommunications Limited (HKT), China Mobile Hong Kong Company Limited, SmarTone Telecommunications Holdings Limited and Hutchison Telecommunications (Hong Kong) Limited had been distributed to Members for perusal prior to the meeting.

76. Mr Sammy TSUI briefly presented the question.

77. Mr WONG Chun-yeung expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He said that although there were fewer base stations in Tung Chung than in urban areas, he was disappointed at the OFCA's failure to attend the meeting to respond to the question. The Government and the OFCA had been vigorously promoting 5G network through TV advertisements and publicity work through various media but had never consulted the public on base station related matters. For example, base stations were constructed without collecting residents' views and providing them with relevant information in advance, arousing concerns of the residents of public rental housing whose roof was constructed with a base station.

- (b) The written reply of the OFCA only claimed that the safety standards of radiation were met, without clearly accounting for the provision ratio of base stations, such as the number of base stations should be provided in a building. Pointing out that most base stations were installed on the roof of public housing blocks, some public housing residents expressed regret over being suppressed. As such, he opined that the OFCA should give the public an explanation, such as the provision ratio of base stations on the roofs of public housing blocks at Tung Chung East reclamation area and Tung Chung West extension area. He urged the OFCA to attend the meeting to respond to Members' questions.
- (c) He enquired whether planning for installation of base stations at locations away from residential dwellings was feasible. He also enquired whether radiation could be blocked after covering base stations with aluminum foil, and whether it was feasible for residents to request the OFCA, the HD or the outsourced service providers of the HD to do so.

78. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He said that there would be four companies installing base stations in Ying Tung Estate and enquired if the base stations would generate radiation and affect the residents. He said that the HKT, the first operator to install the base stations, had largely completed the installation, which was only subject to approval for operation. He criticised the written replies of the HKT and the OFCA as shirking responsibility. It was stated in the second paragraph of the OFCA's written reply that "Technical assessments of the total radiation level within the base station area will be conducted according to the information of base stations provided by the operators to ensure that the total radiation level complies with the radiation safety standards before granting approval for the applications". In other words, the OFCA had to conduct assessments based on the information provided by the operators and decide granting a licence or not, taking into account whether relevant standards were met. It was stated in the written reply of the HKT that "According to the conditions of telecommunications licences, operators are required to obtain approvals from the Communications Authority (CA) before bringing their base stations into operation. The CA has adopted the non-ionizing radiation limits set by the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) as the approval criteria for base stations". He enquired whether approval was granted once relevant criteria were met after assessments conducted according to the information provided by the operators or the base stations could only be brought into operation after approval from the CA was obtained. He considered both practices had problems and therefore the HKT and the OFCA were unwilling to address and discuss the issue.

- (b) He enquired whether the installation of the base stations of the four companies in Ying Tung Estate was a result of the removal of the power plant behind Caribbean Coast for private development, rendering it impossible to install base stations in private housing estates including Caribbean Coast, Century Link and The Visionary.
- (c) According to the written reply of the OFCA, non-ionizing radiation was currently in use, which complied with the requirements and standards of the DH. It also stated that the radiation level was lower and safer than that of X-ray. However, no actual statistics were provided for comparison. The written reply also failed to mention the issue of the simultaneous installation of base stations by the four operators, such as whether the level of radiation generated would substantially increase and cause adverse impact on the health of the residents. He said that the height for installing base stations almost levelled with the top of water tanks. No iron pole or frame was installed to elevate the base stations from the top floor unit. As such, he enquired if the height for installation met the standards. He expressed regret that the OFCA, the department granting approval for and monitoring base stations, failed to attend the meeting to respond to questions that day. A number of residents were worried and plenty of information they searched online suggested that radiation would harm human body and might even cause leukaemia. Therefore, he hoped that the OFCA could provide more statistics to inform Members and the public of the safety level of the base stations.

79. Mr Eric KWOK agreed with the views of Mr Sammy TSUI. He said that the OFCA used ICNIRP as a “shield”, saying that base stations could be installed as long as the committee’s standards were met. However, quoting the information from the International Agency for Research on Cancer, he said that although it was still uncertain whether radiofrequency radiation would cause cancer, it would seriously affect children aged seven or below, especially their brain and might cause brain cancer. In view of the potential risks, he opined that the Government and the OFCA were duty bound to take preventive measures. He also criticised the HD for allowing installation of base stations on the roof of buildings before having a thorough understanding of their harm to human bodies, and considered such practice disputable. He hoped that the Chairman would write to the HD to request avoiding installation of base stations at densely populated locations such as the roof of public housing blocks, and taking preventive measures to block electromagnetic radiation emitted by the existing base stations, such as covering the base stations with aluminum foil or blocking them with lead. He considered it inappropriate to install any base stations at public housing blocks in the future, especially when high importance was attached to public health and living condition in city planning nowadays. He understood the necessity of using the technology but proposed planning and setting up independent radiofrequency radiation sites, instead of installing base stations at densely populated public housing blocks.

80. Mr LEE Ka-ho was disappointed at the OFCA’s failure to attend the

meeting to respond to Members' questions. He pointed out that the replies of all telecommunications companies stated that reference to the OFCA's guidelines was made, but the response of the OFCA was vague and irresponsible. He could only look for relevant information online, such as the total number of base stations in Hong Kong, and the number of them installed on the roof of public housing blocks. The OFCA's absence from the meeting was, as Mr WONG Chun-yeung had said, potentially suppressive to public housing residents. He also pointed out that the OFCA did not respond to the question of Mr Sammy TSUI. It only reiterated the need for compliance of specifications and international standards, but did not specify how to meet the standards. In addition, the OFCA did not account for the measures taken to ensure that the residents were unaffected by radiation. He agreed with Mr Eric KWOK's proposal that the Chairman should write to the OFCA to request an explanation and its attendance at the next meeting to respond to Members' questions.

81. Mr WONG Chun-yeung said that in view of the OFCA's absence from the meeting, he wished to move a provisional motion and the discussion on which was subject to the Chairman's approval. He read out the title of the motion as follows: "Request for protective covers for all base stations in housing estates across the territory". The provisional motion was seconded by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho.

82. Ms Josephine TSANG said that Peng Chau residents were worried that the radiation generated at the base stations near residential dwellings would have an adverse impact on health. She called the OFCA, which later deployed staff to the site to assess the level of radiation, conducted tests when the complainant was present and explained information related to radiation level, so as to allay public concern.

83. Ms Amy YUNG said that the same issue was also widely discussed in private housing estates in Discovery Bay a decade ago. Many owners' committees hoped that telecommunication companies would install base stations on their roofs, because they could receive allowances for subsidising management fees, but it was eventually opposed by the residents. At present, the base stations in Discovery Bay were mainly located at high places such as reservoirs and hillsides and they functioned properly, so that installation on the roof was unnecessary. She said that "perception is reality". If the residents believed that radiation was harmful, their concern could not be eased even if a scientific explanation was provided. She said that health was priceless. It was unwise if the HD sacrificed the health of residents for the interests of telecommunication companies.

84. Mr Sammy TSUI enquired how the OFCA set the safety standards. For example, how to judge whether the height and locations of the base stations installed in Ying Tung Estate met the standards. It was undesirable to study how to meet the safety standards after approval was granted. He enquired if the OFCA would identify other locations to install the remaining base stations. He pointed out that while the HKT had installed its base stations, the other three telecommunication companies planning to install base stations did not attend the meeting, and therefore Members could not express views or exchange ideas with them. It would be too late to stop the project after installation was completed. He agreed that the Chairman should request the OFCA to address the problem squarely in the form of a letter, such

as enquiring whether base stations could be installed as far away from residential areas as possible, and whether the base stations, if installed on the roofs of public housing blocks, could be elevated. He was concerned that the base stations would have long-term impact on the residents, and if the impacts emerged eight to ten years later, it would be an unknown who would assume responsibility and make compensation.

85. The Chairman consolidated Members' views as follows:

- (a) Regarding the impact of base stations to the residents, given that the OFCA did not send representatives to the meeting, he would discuss with the Secretariat about writing to the OFCA to relay Members' views, such as Mr Sammy TSUI's enquiry on whether the residents would be affected by the height and density of base stations. He was also concerned whether total radiation generated by the four telecommunication companies would affect the residents. Although it was stated in the written replies that the existing base stations approved for operation involved about 10 000 locations, and the situation was still safe, he said he would write to the OFCA to confirm it was genuine and learn more about the situation.
- (b) The motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung had only a title. He opined that Members could, upon receipt of the OFCA's reply, move a motion if it was deemed necessary. He proposed that Mr WONG Chun-yeung should draft the motion for discussion at the meeting of the Community Affairs, Culture and Recreation Committee or Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee (TAFEHCCC) the following month. If the motion was put to vote at the meeting without relevant statistics, he was worried that many Members would abstain from voting.

86. Mr WONG Chun-yeung said that the OFCA, after receiving letters from the IDC, usually said that it noted the issue and would listen to the views and commence different work only. He said that the reason for moving the provisional motion was to avoid discussion of matters concerning statistics or science. For example, in the past, when discussing issues such as the works of Lantau Tomorrow Vision, they would not discuss about the feasibility of the project from a mathematical and scientific perspective. He intended to request the IDC to put pressure on the OFCA and the HD in the form of a letter to show the public that the IDC was concerned about the issue. He pointed out that the IDC was only an advisory body. It had no authority to force the Government to roll out measures for the community or residents. As such, the provisional motion was raised to put pressure on relevant departments for concrete actions rather than to initiate discussion on technical feasibility.

87. The Chairman proposed following up on the issue in two stages. He would consolidate the views Members expressed at the meeting and relay them to the OFCA in the form of a letter first. If Members were dissatisfied with the reply, they

could then move the motion at meetings of the two committees mentioned above to put pressure on the OFCA.

88. Mr Ken WONG said that the seventh IDC meeting would be held on 14 December. As there were ten working days to go, an official motion could be submitted in time. He proposed checking relevant information while waiting for the reply of the OFCA before discussing the issue later.

89. The Chairman clarified that in accordance with the Standing Orders, the deadline for paper submission, i.e. midnight the previous Friday, had passed, so only a provisional motion could be moved. If Members agreed that it took time to collect and study the information, he advised Mr WONG Chun-yeung and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho to draft and submit the motion for discussion at the meetings.

90. Mr WONG Chun-yeung said that he had drafted the provisional motion and read it out as follows: “Telecommunication operators should take into account the interests of public housing residents when installing base stations. As such, I request protective covers for all base stations at housing estates across the territory to safeguard public health.” He pointed out that the motion aimed at requesting the OFCA to face the problem squarely and take further actions. Members did not need to discuss technical issues but to request the OFCA to bear the responsibility. He considered the motion fair and reasonable, and could be handed over to the OFCA for implementation after being endorsed. He said that he was not asking the base stations to comply with the most stringent world standards and generate no radiation at all. He simply requested the OFCA to coordinate with the HD and take appropriate measures at all base stations or those close to residential areas, such as covering them with aluminum foil and study further ways to improve and solve the problem.

91. The Chairman said that he had allowed Mr WONG Chun-yeung to express his views on the item five times and the discussion should come to an end. He had two enquiries on the provisional motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Firstly, while Mr WONG Chun-yeung proposed taking measures at all housing estates across the territory, he suggested focusing on the problems in the Islands District given that the IDC could not express views on behalf of the other 17 DCs. Secondly, he had little understanding on the measure regarding the protective cover and had doubt on its effectiveness. He also considered the effects of endorsing the motion and writing to the OFCA were of no difference. He pointed out that as no government departments attended the meeting to discuss the item, the discussion should end here and follow-up actions could be taken upon receipt of the OFCA’s reply.

92. Mr WONG Chun-yeung said that he understood the viewpoint of the Chairman but considered him adopting double standards. He thanked the Chairman for allowing discussion of the item related to the Lantau Tomorrow Vision raised by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho at the meeting. However, he pointed out that Mr LEUNG’s motion only referred to the huge cost of the Lantau Tomorrow Vision project and did not mention the relevant assessments or technical work. Neither cost estimates of the entire project nor further details was provided as well. He queried why the

Chairman approved discussion of the provisional motion on the Lantau Tomorrow Vision but rejected his motion concerning people's livelihood. He emphasised that the rationale for moving the motion was to inform the government departments of the views of the IDC and force the OFCA to follow up on the issue through the provisional motion.

93. The Chairman said that he had already adopted a lenient approach and allowed Mr WONG to speak for the sixth time.

94. Mr Ken WONG proposed processing items arising from the previous meeting first. Otherwise, items not yet discussed might have to be left for the next meeting, which would be unfair to other Members. If Mr WONG Chun-yeung insisted on moving the provisional motion, he should express his views in the remaining time to avoid affecting meeting efficiency.

95. The Chairman said that it might be more time consuming to discuss the item again later. He had raised two enquires concerning the provisional motion. As Mr WONG Chun-yeung considered him handling the item partially, he proposed a vote on whether to continue the discussion on the provisional motion. If the majority opposed, Mr WONG should submit the motion later.

96. Ms Josephine TSANG supported the Chairman's proposal and opined that the discussion was empty as no department responded to the questions concerning statistics.

97. Mr Eric KWOK suggested the Chairman exercising discretion to allow motion submission by Mr WONG Chun-yeung at the IDC meeting to be held on 14 December. Despite supporting the motion of Mr WONG Chun-yeung, he considered it meaningless to move the motion at present as no department representative was present.

98. The Chairman thanked Mr Eric KWOK for his views but opined that his proposal would increase the workload of the Secretariat and there might not be sufficient time to invite departments to give response at the meeting. If preparation time was insufficient, the departments might not send representatives to the meeting. He proposed voting on whether discussion on the provisional motion should continue. As for exercising discretion, he proposed that Mr WONG Chun-yeung could draft the question in the meantime. He could then discretionarily enquire if the OFCA would send representatives to the meeting, and if not, Mr WONG Chun-yeung might need to consider submitting the motion again to appropriate committees for discussion.

99. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether discussion on the provisional motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung should continue.

100. Members voted by a show of hands. There were five votes in favour, ten against and one abstention. The proposal of continuing the discussion on the provisional motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung was not endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Members voted against included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Mr Eric KWOK abstained.) (Mr CHOW Yuk-tong and Mr YUNG Chi-ming were absent in the afternoon.)

101. The Chairman asked Mr WONG Chun-yeung to consider the proposal he raised earlier.

XXI. Reports on the Work of the IDC Committees
(Paper IDC 135-138/2020)

102. Ms Josephine TSANG said that it was endorsed at the TAFEHCCC meeting on 23 November 2020 to apply to the IDC for an allocation of \$93,750 from the 2020-2021 reserved fund to the Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee Activities Working Group for organising tourism promotion programmes in the Islands District this year. He asked Members to consider and approve the funding application.

103. Mr Eric KWOK supplemented on the question on proposal of rationalisation of green minibus route no. 901 in item 4 of Paper IDC 137/2020. At the end of the paragraph, “and study Members’ proposal of connecting Tung Chung West, Tung Chung town centre, Tung Chung East, Tung Chung North, Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Port, AsiaWorld-Expo and the Airport.” should be added.

104. The Chairman asked Members to note the paper.

105. Members voted on the funding application of the TAFEHCCC mentioned by Ms Josephine TSANG by a show of hands, and the funding application was endorsed with 15 votes in favour, none against and one abstention.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. Mr WONG Chun-yeung abstained.) (Mr CHOW Yuk-tong and Mr YUNG Chi-ming were absent in the afternoon.)

XXII. Allocation of DC funds

(i) Up-to-date Financial Position on the Use of DC Funds
(Paper IDC 139/2020)

106. The 16 Members present voted by a show of hands, and the paper was endorsed unanimously.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung.)

(ii) Approval for Using DC Funds by circulation from 1 August to 30 September 2020
(Paper IDC 140/2020)

107. Members noted the paper.

XXIII. Date of Next Meeting

108. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m. The next meeting would be held on 14 December 2020 (Monday) at 10:30 a.m.

-END-